School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1333175

THE CHANGING FAMILY

GEORGE WALTER FISKE

225

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

-ex libris
Paul B. Irwin

THE CHANGING FAMILY

OTHER BOOKS BY DR. FISKE

PURPOSE IN TEACHING RELIGION

JESUS' IDEALS OF LIVING

COMMUNITY FORCES FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: EARLY ADOLESCENCE

COMMUNITY FORCES FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: MIDDLE ADOLESCENCE

FINDING THE COMRADE GOD

BOY-LIFE AND SELF-GOVERNMENT

THE CHALLENGE OF THE COUNTRY

4Q
734
F5

THE CHANGING FAMILY

Social and Religious Aspects of the Modern Family

BY

GEORGE WALTER FISKE, Ph.D

Professor of Religious Education
The Graduate School of Theology
Oberlin College

HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
M CM XXVIII

THE CHANGING FAMILY

Copyright, 1928, by George Walter Fiske

Printed in the U. S. A.

First Edition

M-C

All rights reserved, including that of translation into foreign languages, including the Scandinavian.

The Bible text printed in this volume is taken from the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible, Copyright, 1901, by Thomas Nelson & Sons, and is used by permission.

TO THE FOUR WOMEN
WHO HAVE MADE MY HOME
A PLACE OF INFINITE PRECIOUSNESS:

MY WIFE
MY MOTHER MY SISTER MY DAUGHTER

THIS BOOK IS LOVINGLY INSCRIBED

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY xi

Chapter

I. THE MODERN FAMILY AND RELIGION 1

Great temples call for restoration
What ails the home?
Results of home neglect
A project in religious reconstruction

II. WHOSE IS THE CHILD? 13

The school's expanding functions
The priority of family responsibility
Parents must not abdicate

III. WHAT HAPPENED TO THE OLD-TIME HOME? 19

Courageous independence of American homesteaders
The old-time family self-sustaining
All social functions came from the home
Specialization scattered the old home functions

IV. OUR DEBT TO THE OLD HOME 30

A tribute to an old New England home
"The Farm: Best Home of the Family"
The old-time family unity and loyalty
Undesirable features of old-time home
The mysterious charm of an old Colonial house

V. OUR OBLIGATION TO MAINTAIN A HOME 46

The futile host of marriage slackers
What about the bachelor maids?
When marriage does not mean a home
When two plus one makes more than three

VI. THE CITY HOME'S STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL 57

The modern centrifugal family
The social complex of the urban home

CONTENTS

Chapter

Space for a home: the city housing problem
The notable growth of suburban homes
The problem of a home-centered life
Reclaim the non-functioning home

VII. THE NEW STATUS OF WOMAN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES 78

What difference has the franchise made?
The miracle of feminine education
Woman's astonishing inroads into industry
The most radical change in history
The effect upon birth-rate and death-rate
The family type is being modified
When a married woman's career is justified
The supreme career, home-making

VIII. NEW COMPLICATIONS THROUGH CHANGING SOCIAL STANDARDS 105

Fresh complications due to speed
Other aspects of the new freedom
Nervous tension and moral overstrain
Insidious thrill-chasing
The lure of companionate marriage
A perversion of true marriage
Willingness to defy conventions
Increasing tragedy of broken homes
The drift from ethical moorings

IX. THE MODERN CHILD'S OWN SOCIAL PROBLEMS 132

Getting along with their parents
Acute problems of high-school youth
Some sample problems of school girls
The problem of social pressure
The moral dangers of joy-riding
Some high-school girl-boy problems
Shall mechanism or idealism win?
"How shall we decide which is right?"

X. THE RELIGIOUS PROBLEM OF YOUTH TODAY 153

A modern church for modern children
The youth's problem with the Bible

CONTENTS

Chapter

The need of seeing religion lived
The handicap of non-religious parents

XI. KEEPING YOUNG WITH YOUTH 166
Bridging the chasm of the ages
No admittance except to the childlike
The sharing of youthful interests

XII. OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD OUR CHILDREN 174
Children no longer an economic asset
Are children a family handicap?
Must superior families die out?
Is a different family attitude possible?
The infinite worth-whileness of children
The new appreciation of childhood

XIII. HOME TYRANNY, ANARCHY, OR DEMOCRACY? 188
The old-time home despotism
The anarchy in ultra-modern homes
A true family democracy

XIV. HOW RELIGION STABILIZES THE FAMILY 201
Where religion is only an heirloom
Wanted: A religion that affects life
How home religion becomes effective insurance

XV. THE RELIGIOUS DEDICATION OF THE HOME 211
The origin of a beautiful custom
Litany for all fathers and mothers
The symbolism of the hearthstone
The unveiling of new pictures
A recent Oberlin home dedication

XVI. SOME RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS OF PARENTS 224
Some searching tests of home religion
Making religion worth more personally
Bringing religion up-to-date
Making religion simpler, prayer more real
Home training in the art of worship
Practicing religion in conduct
The problem of making life beautiful

CONTENTS

Chapter

XVII. Is There a Modern Family Bible? 247

Just how is the Bible inspired?
Some popular fallacies about the Bible
The great gains of the modern Bible
Tracing the Bible's pedigree
The greatest of all "best sellers"
A religious source book for the modern family

XVIII. Grading the Bible for Children and Youth 269

Unrivalled source-book for the life of the spirit
An indispensable part of modern culture
The key to English and American literature
The call for a book of the Bible's best
Adapting the Bible to the needs of children
The matchless book of ideals for youth

XIX. Home Coöperation with the Church 294

Who is really educating your boy?
Coöperating with community agencies
The House of the Interpreter
Character values of religious activities
Living contacts between home and church

XX. Rebuilding the Temple of Home Religion 307

Solution awaits the coming of a better race
The family problem fundamentally religious
A community challenge and a worthy answer
The modernizing of family religion

INTRODUCTORY

There is little new in the fact that the family is changing. Everything living changes. The evolution of the human family has been the most significant aspect of the rise of the race from savagery. Before

> ". . . the first man stood God-conquered
> With his face to heaven upturned,"

he stood mate-conquered, with his face turned toward *the Child*, awed in the presence of the miracle of birth, his savage heart domesticated,—and the struggle for the life of others had begun.

The birth of altruism founded the home. Nothing can seriously threaten it but a selfish individualism which would be a reversion to type, a leap back to the jungle. Exactly this danger the ultra-modern city family is facing: *Individualism run amuck*. Life in the past was home-centered. But now the urban family is fast becoming cen-

trifugal. With the vast enrichment of life, its diversified interests, its high specialization, little is left of the old home functions. It is difficult to maintain family unity and loyalty and a home-centered life while each member of the household is restlessly bent on pursuing his own independent way of self-expression. Too often the motives of selfish pleasure and ambition have destroyed the morale of the group.

But the recent phases of the changing family are new and the chief cause is not hard to locate. In the past, family stability rested on male autocracy. It has been a man's world, and still is in most countries. With the husband kinging-it on the family throne, backed by the laws of the state, radical change in family status was next to impossible. But the cost of stability was female serfdom. Now that woman has won complete emancipation and equality with man, we must seek a new stabilizer for the family.

In no small measure the present readjustment of the family, that is causing a good deal of disintegration as well as much progress, is the result of the new freedom of women. Their new industrial independence, both before and after marriage, is modifying the family type in subtle ways. The

male tyranny is replaced by a two-headed commission! Women are spending more of the money, and are earning much of it. They demand most of the divorces, and often deserve them. They are daring to vote on the birth-rate. By the thousands they are demonstrating their ability and right to a career, and have definitely raised the passing-mark for bridegrooms. Emancipated women, having achieved full personality at last, are requiring new adjustments in marriage; some quite justified, others questionable, especially when coupled with social radicalism and the loss of religious restraints.

And so, for these and sundry other reasons, we have with us in these hectic post-war days the problems of non-functioning homes, broken homes, marriage slackers, birth-control, trial marriage, divorce by mutual consent, and similar symptoms of the rule of General Laxity. Surely, in the midst of this *mélange*, if the best the sociologists have to propose is *companionate marriage*, it forces us to believe that social science, unaided by religion, is spiritually bankrupt. No wonder many are anxiously asking, What will be the goal of the Changing Family? Whither are we bound?

To offset the new cynicism and the selfishness

of extreme individualism, how shall we create a new idealism strong enough to hold fast the priceless values of the Christian family? The writer believes the best insurance against broken homes is family religion. The acid test of religion is to help folks entangled in the social complications of modern city living to solve the problems of the family. It must be a progressive religion, unafraid of modern science, and a vital religion, knowing its sources and in living touch with the Father-God. It will, and in millions of homes does, furnish ideals of unselfish motherhood, staunch fatherhood, the infinite worthwhileness of children, and the conviction that the purpose of the family is not selfish indulgence, but the welfare of the child. The greatest possible stabilizer of the family is vital religion. Hence this volume includes both sociological analysis and a constructive interpretation of religion for the changing family.

Reference is made in the text to a keenly intelligent group of people in Cleveland who challenged the writer to make a seminar study of their suburban family problems with them last winter. Their beautiful suburb, their lovely homes, and their loyal, stimulating friendship have been the background of this investigation into the fascinating tangles of the modern family. They were so fre-

quently in his mind as he wrote the manuscript, and their discussions of the material were so stimulating, he regards the book as a really coöperative product, in which they and their brilliant minister, Dr. Joel B. Hayden, had a very definite share. This indebtedness is here gratefully acknowledged.

The author wishes to thank the following publishers for their written permission to quote their copyrighted material: The Houghton Mifflin Company, Williams and Wilkins, The Macmillan Company, J. B. Lippincott Company, The University of Chicago Press, G. B. Putnam's Sons, The Pilgrim Press, The Abingdon Press, The Doran Company, and Charles Scribner's Sons. In connection with each quotation, proper footnote reference is made to book-title, author, and publisher. Certain parts of this manuscript have been pre-printed in *The Christian Century*, *The Literary Digest*, *The Presbyterian Banner*, and *The Oberlin News*. The courtesy of the editors in allowing revision and republishing is hereby acknowledged.

Every effort has been made to trace the ownership of all copyright material which has been quoted and to secure publishers' permission to quote. Should any infringement have been unconsciously made, the author desires hereby to express his regrets. He will be glad on notifica-

tion to make proper acknowledgement in future editions of this book.

The author owes especial thanks to Dr. Norman E. Richardson of Northwestern University and the Reverend Ivan R. Welty of Detroit for sharing their data regarding current problems of young people and children. The former's recent researches in the current experience of high-school youth have added to his reputation as an outstanding authority on adolescence. Thanks are also due Professor H. Augustine Smith of Boston University, and my colleague, Professor Walter M. Horton of Oberlin, for material used in Chapter XV. The author is also indebted to both Mr. and Mrs. Welty for their critical reading of the manuscript, and he wishes to acknowledge his unique debt to his comrade in many a life quest, Mrs. Alice Stewart Fiske, for her sympathetic and discriminating help, not only in the reading of the proofs, but also in subjecting every chapter of the text to the penetrating scrutiny of the best home-maker the author has ever known. No man could write a worthy book on the subject of the Family without the help of his wife! In this instance the partnership has been a very real one.

GEORGE WALTER FISKE.

Oberlin, Ohio, October 25, 1928.

THE CHANGING FAMILY

Chapter I

The Modern Family and Religion

Great temples have a deplorable way of falling out of repair. Earthquakes, fires, explosions and the ravages of war demolish them. They are always weathering, but seldom wear out through overmuch use; though the steps to the temple of Jove in old Pompeii are worn down astonishingly by the tread of countless devotees before the Christian era.

However, some notable reconstruction projects are making good progress now in beloved Old World shrines. The wonderful Parthenon, most perfect work of human hands, which literally crowns Athens, wrecked two centuries ago by a gunpowder explosion, is at last being gradually restored by painstaking artisans. The west façade is nearly complete. The glory of the Acropolis may again be made perfect.

Poor abused Rheims, once the loveliest of

Christian temples, bombarded periodically for four awful years, is now making the fabled phœnix jealous. Thanks to good American money and architectural genius, its nave is completely restored, many of its lovely windows are once more glorious in the sunlight, and this western half of the cathedral is daily used for worship.

A more modest shrine, though far more sacred for the invisible footprints of the Master, the Capernaum synagogue, is also rising from its sad ruins after long neglect. That first-century earthquake hardly left one stone upon another. But the stones are all there and are slowly finding their true places again, under skillful archeological guidance. Given the drive of a consecrated purpose, ruined temples can be restored. Somehow the will finds a way.

Another precious temple is calling for restoration. It is the temple of home religion. Once it was the world's chief shrine, for "the father was God's first priest." Faith in God was born there. The prayer life found first simple, trustful expression there. Love for Christ and sturdy Christian character were nurtured there. But something has happened to this temple of the home. The earthquake of modern speed and efficiency has

shaken it. The internal explosions of modern doubts have silenced its inner voices. The attacks of modern social competitions have left it in ruin and neglect. Alas for the temple our fathers reared!

It is beside the mark to cite the fact that here and there, in sheltered places where modern speed and fury and social upheaval have not yet arrived, the temple of home religion still maintains its old-time altar fires. Where the social standards of the past still prevail, the good old religious customs of the fathers still survive. We fear it is too nearly true that in the typically modern home the temple is seldom in evidence. Religion is regarded as an anachronism. It is out of date. And to be out of style is the unspeakable condemnation. It is perhaps reverenced as a family heirloom; condemned to either the dust of the garret or the equally useless status of glass-case admiration. In either case, religion reduced to an heirloom becomes too grandmotherly to challenge the interest of youth today.

If this condition is really general in nominally Christian homes, what should be done about it? Should we sit complacently on the rocks, watching the receding tide, hoping that it is a tide which in

due season will flow once more and come back strong? Or shall we discover that it was no tidal-sea whatever, but an irrigation basin fed by the invisible springs of mountain-top religion, the blessed waters of which kept fertile and productive the church's harvest fields of youth and childhood? No, complacency is not the attitude appropriate to such a situation. The tide theory, or the pendulum theory, will not apply. Investigation is our first cue. Let us discover the facts. Let us find out the extent of the neglect or the ruin of the temple and whether it is desirable or practicable to reconstruct it.

Quite possibly a perfect restoration of the former structure, with the identical altar and a replica of the shrine in all details, may not meet the needs of modern family religion. Life does not halt, except in stagnant pools. Just what was the effect upon our own childhood of the home religion of our parents? In what respects was it helpful and in what ways obsolete? We are not thinking, of course, merely of the custom of family prayers. That is only part of the temple of home religion, though an important one. There is a holy of holies even more vital—the personal religion of the father and the mother, the felt genuineness of their work-

ing faith, their trust in God, their dependence upon prayer, their loyalty to Christ and the church.

WHAT AILS THE HOME?

"The Puritan strictness of my early home," says a woman in early middle life, "kept me out of the church for fifteen years, and I have only recently found my way back." Perhaps the temple of the past lacked Parthenon perfection, after all. Some are inclined to say, "The old home isn't what it used to be; and it never was!" Yet the home religion of the past had strong, enduring values, indispensable values which we cannot spare, the lack of which is crippling the religious life and experience of the church today. Let us find out exactly what these values were.

Our next quest for facts will be in the realm of the present-day home. We are quite conscious that all is not well with it. The query, "What ails our youth?" is thrown back in our teeth by these selfsame youth, who retort, "What ails our parents?" After five years' study of the youth movement the wisest syndics say that parental delinquencies account for most of our current troubles over youthful rebellions and loss of ideals. Have

the craze for pleasure, the prevailing go-fever caused by universal motoring, the bridge obsession, the wave of extravagance in living, the new type of mother minus the sacrificial heart, the business-slave father (with golf-craze compensations), the inevitable specialization of life, taking out of the home most of its former functions and reducing it sometimes to a mere dormitory and irregular cafeteria—have these and other ultra-modern symptoms so denatured our Christian home that the adjective no longer seems appropriate and even the noun is disappearing? The very question seems pessimistic, but is intended only to suggest the urgency of a real crisis.

In the midst of this welter of social changes, what is happening to religion? Something is happening, and so stealthily that we are failing to realize it. The family is gradually abdicating its responsibilities. To a degree this is a sign of rising civilization, but if it goes much further, the non-functioning home will resign itself out of existence. The children are not only barbered, tailored, shod and doctored by outside experts, when in the homespun days all these wants were attended to at home, rather badly on the whole; they are not

only schooled, churched, exercised and danced and manually trained outside, to the relief of burdened parents; but their lives are now so fully controlled by outside influences that the family no longer controls their ideals, social standards, moral responsibilities and religious loyalties, if any.

That is to say, the home, ceasing to function in so many lines, because modern specialization has assigned these functions to outside experts, has now resigned its religious function also. Religion has become so professionalized that too many parents are apt to say, "Here is my check, Lord; send him!" "Here is my paid minister, my hired director of religious education, my paid church-school teacher—now make my child religious!" And the non-functioning father, modestly feeling that these experts know more about religion than he, and can teach it better, complacently reads his Sunday supplement at the hour when his father used to teach him "the regular Sunday-school lesson." The question is, where will this specialization trend ever stop? Where is the limit to this surrendering of the functions of the family? Is there really any substitute for home religion? Can fathers and mothers resign?

RESULTS OF HOME NEGLECT

Already in some quarters, very modern children, precociously *blasé*, are revealing the results of this process of neglect. It is disconcerting to discover these revelations in some of our modernized church schools. Yet perhaps it is in just such churches that parents are most apt to abdicate their religious responsibilities. "I'm tired of this Jesus business. Let's have a livelier kind of stories," was the astonishing remark of an eleven-year-old when a new course of graded lessons was commencing in the fall. "I've discovered dad is Santa Claus and the stork, and now I'm going to look into this Jesus Christ affair," said another emancipated youngster.

"Why do you come to Sunday school?" a teacher asked his junior department, hoping to learn their real motives. Various reasons were offered, then one little girl confessed: "Well, I was home and father came into the kitchen with muddy boots and tracked the floor. Mother jawed him for it and he talked back. Finally mother said to me, 'If I had any way of getting out of this place, I surely would. Why don't you go to Sunday school

and get away from it all?' So I did and so I'm here." Children's uncomplimentary opinions of their parents, and their feelings of genuine grievance and sometimes bitter complaint, are freely shared with sympathetic teachers. Many concrete instances might be cited here. Does it not all suggest the need of restoring religion in the modern home? And may it not only be a religion as deep and high as the faith of our fathers, but as broad as the complex social challenge of our own day?

Probably these ultra-modern conditions obtain more generally in our lovely city suburbs than anywhere else today. Here life is most comfortable, luxurious and delightful, if not most leisurely. Here are all the advantages of both city and rural life, with few of the drawbacks of either. Here life is most highly specialized and civilization rises to its highest level. Here children, though not numerous, are most tenderly nurtured, their welfare most intelligently studied and their varied needs most thoroughly served. Yet, strangely enough, in such suburban communities the problems of childlife are far from simple, and the problems of youth are exceedingly complex, especially high-school youth.

To such a highly-favored suburb the writer was recently called in to study the religious problems of the young people and their parents and to lead the latter in the coöperative project of discovering possible solutions. The mutual quest soon resolved itself into an earnest endeavor to reconstruct religion in the modern home. The group was an alert company of educated men and women, progressive in their social and religious outlook and devoted to their homes and their children. Though they appreciate the old-time home and what it did for them, they criticize it frankly and do not wish to go back to the past but forward to something better, something more human and natural but equally religious and sincere.

The problem which confronts us in such a situation is this: Is a fresh technic in home religion possible? Must the modern home go back to the old-time religious forms and usages, or be irreligious? Must the religion of the educated man and woman be lacking in warmth and true feeling? Clear and reasonable in its theological thinking, must it be lacking in emotional power, as some

conservatives assert? Clear thinking alone does not make progress. It only makes progress possible by pointing the way. The rudder does not propel the boat. Power in religion must come from the realm of the feelings, whence comes all psychic power good and bad. If modern religion is ever to gain power for progress, it must develop stronger religious *feelings*, deeper loyalties, stronger sentiments and convictions. It needs dynamic for ideals. Can the modern, educated, cultured home ever develop the necessary spiritual power to make its modern religion really vital and victorious, until somehow it develops a fresh technic for home religion at the heart of the church's life?

These earnest questions, most poignantly timely and pressing, burned themselves into the hearts of some of the men and women in that suburban group mentioned above. They sought data and assistance from other communities and the frank sharing of experience. They gathered additional data about the status of religion in other kinds of homes. They collected concrete case material on the religious problems of modern boys and girls, especially of high-school age, their attitude toward their parents, the church and religion, their diffi-

culties with their Bible, *et cetera.* They soon discovered that a real religious crisis exists in the modern home that calls for thorough study and a facing of the facts. The present volume is one of the results of their quest.

Chapter II

Whose Is the Child?

At a recent educational conference a former teacher made this snappy observation, "When I was a young teacher, the church took care of the child's spirit, the home of his manners and morals, and the school of his intellect; but now the whole care of the child is dumped on *the school*, even to his eyes and teeth." Then with strange inconsistency she proceeded to blame the school for its failure to develop character!

We have come to a queer *impasse*, in which many educational leaders seem bent on making the school system the one functioning organ of American society, while the rank and file of teachers are groaning under the increasing complexity of their impossible task. The longer school day in the socialized school, the summer sessions and vacation schools, the new vogue of the nursery school anticipating the kindergarten, while poor parents work and rich

parents play, all tend to magnify the school at the expense of the home and perhaps of the child.

THE SCHOOL'S EXPANDING FUNCTIONS

Nor is it simply a question of the time involved. The socialized schedule with its humanizing of the whole educational process has vastly enriched the content of the school program, with real gain in efficiency. But again, this school efficiency is not only a substitute for family inefficiency, but home opportunity. It has robbed the home, even though the parents were in collusion. One function after another the modern school has assumed—for two reasons, only one of which is good. It cannot be denied that pride in the school system has led some educators to inflate its opportunity; as the Army and Navy Club stimulates jingoism with its congressional lobby and thrives on constantly advertising "the next war."

A better reason for the ever-broadening functions of the school is to unify if not to simplify the child's daily curriculum and to give the child a carefully controlled environment under more or less expert guidance. So long as a vast number of homes fail to function even respectably, to the

neglect of vast numbers of children, so long the school must supplement the work of neglectful parents. Hence the need of the free milk service, the cafeteria, the school doctor and the nurse, the medical examination and the dental clinic. The educational theory back of this inflation of school functions is a twofold one: As the needs of the child are neglected at home, society must meet these needs through the school; and there should be unity in the educational process and environment. This seems to assume both that the home cannot be taught and made to function adequately and that it cannot be induced to coöperate with the school.

THE PRIORITY OF FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY

We wish to question these last conclusions, and meanwhile remind our readers that the child belongs primarily to the home, not to the school. The priority of the home's claim and responsibility cannot be questioned; nor the superiority of the home's influence when rightly exercised. As regards many of these recently acquired functions, the school can claim to be only a substitute for the home at best, and the teacher only a foster-mother. Too many

teachers have been called to bat as "pinch-hitters" because fathers have stopped making "sacrifice hits." The pinch-hitting policy may win more games, for the teacher is usually better trained; but it is bad for the home team to see father lounging lazily on the bleachers, smoking a "Camel" or eating ice-cream, when he ought to be at bat. He needs more batting practice and less dodging when emergencies come.

In fact, there is another unfortunate aspect of the situation that reminds one altogether too much of the educational policy of Rousseau. So completely did he distrust the home and idealize the school, he taught that the state should supplant the family in the business of child-nurture and that the whole process should be socialized and conducted as a community enterprise, thus freeing parents entirely from their natural responsibilities and burdens and supposedly insuring a uniform efficiency in the bringing up of children. The Soviet leaders in Russia are reported to have favored to a considerable extent this policy; but have we not gone a long way in the same direction in America? The family is naturally and chiefly an organism; but the school is rather inevitably an institution. As early education becomes monopolized by the school,

how can we avoid its becoming more mechanized and less and less human? If the child is adopted as the protégé of the school, and almost as the foster-child of the teacher, even though there may be some physical gain, as measured in terms of tonsils, teeth, adenoids and goitre, what shall it profit a child if this gain be at the expense of intimate home fellowships and the blessing of a true development of moral and spiritual life? Due credit should be given a resourceful school system for introducing modern efficiency into its program, to supplement the deficiencies of neglectful families. But it should be clearly understood that much of this loading of the school with social-service burdens is not at all ideal, but is due to the neglect by many families of their natural responsibilities.

PARENTS MUST NOT ABDICATE

Is even a perfectly socialized school, then, the final answer to this problem, were such a thing possible? Will the problem ever be solved except by the family itself? This is practically asking the question, Are fathers and mothers necessary, except for biological purposes? This book is written with the conviction that our American homes must func-

tion again with complete responsibility for the social, intellectual and spiritual welfare of their children; that they must take back some of the responsibilities they have so readily handed over to teachers and other specialists in this over-specialized age. The school can never be a home. The most perfect school cannot save civilization. It cannot be done without a true home, for the child is of the home and is orphaned without it. It is always as futile as it is foolish to worship the past or attempt to go back to it. To restore the old-time home is probably as undesirable as it would be impossible. But it has much to teach us, and at least we should retrace the way we have wandered from it and discover what we may have lost in human values meanwhile.

Chapter III

What Happened to the Old-Time Home?

It is still a glorious tradition, with something of a golden halo, perhaps, seen through the haze of the passing years. It may have gathered more or less of legendary lore in its coming from generations past *via* the family heritage of grandfatherly gossip. But back of the haze and the halo stands the real fact: the Colonial home, with all its strenuous hardships, in spite of its heroic birth-rate and alarming death-rate, produced men and women of sterling character who became nation-builders and continent-conquerors.

It is a phenomenon calling for explanation, that a puny shoestring settlement of thirteen weak Colonies hugging the coast-line, with barely three million people and the meagerest resources both material and cultural, and isolated from the great stream of world forces, should in a century and a half grow fortyfold into a dominant world power,

financially supreme, and so influential commercially and politically as to be the envy of all nations and the goal of unknown millions of would-be immigrants who patiently wait for years for their turn in "the quota." What four generations in the history of any other people have ever shown such marvelous progress and rise to world power? And what made this miracle possible? Vast material resources had much to do with it, but would never have accomplished it without the old-time home and its development of sturdy character, faith, courage and skill.

COURAGEOUS INDEPENDENCE OF AMERICAN HOMESTEADERS

To be sure, under pioneer conditions the family always becomes a social microcosm because of the scarcity of neighbors in frontier life; but nowhere else has this family isolation been welcomed with such nonchalance and accepted as a permanently desirable and normal mode of living. Elsewhere the world's farmers have lived in huddled villages, seldom in lordly independence on the fields they till. Our national homesteading policy has helped develop on an enormous scale the scattering of

homes over wide prairies and mountain slopes and forests, so that the average distance to neighbors is half a mile, and often many times more, for the American farm averages 144 acres. In Japan, with the average farm but 2.6 acres, neighbors would average only twenty rods distant, even if they were scattered away from their compact rural villages.

American village life, both suburban and urban, is now rapidly growing at the expense of the open-country districts, and there are many good reasons for this population movement. It is likely to continue. But there is no denying that the unique independence of our farm homes of the past, their courageous facing of the wilderness with its perils and its lonely isolation, gave glorious proof of the victorious quality, the stamina, the staunch sturdiness of the old American stock. And it is futile to debate whether such homes developed such sturdy character, or the reverse, for it must have worked both ways, with cumulative power.

THE OLD-TIME FAMILY SELF-SUSTAINING

Two characteristics were common to the pioneer homes, large families of eight to twelve children, and a bewildering variety of labor. The family

was a self-contained society, a little self-sustaining world within itself—dependent on God and the weather, but on little else. Its needs were marvelously few which it could not itself supply. Necessity was originally the mother of this vast inventiveness, but it was partly a matter of pride for the household to be self-serving. No hundred-per-cent American of the twentieth century ever gloried in the "Made in the U.S.A." label more smugly than the complacent eighteenth-century American prided himself on what was made under his own ridgepole or grown on his own acres.

This attitude helped to foster countless home industries, and often to impart to them the cultural values of domestic arts and crafts. Thus every farm home (when few homes were not farm homes) was a factory and a repair shop; a shoe shop and a cobblery, a carpenter shop, a soap factory and tallow chandlery; a cotton and woolen mill for carding, spinning and weaving, a flax and linen factory and a garment factory; a brewery and a bakery and perhaps, alas, a distillery; and even a gristmill, a tannery and a blacksmithy when occasion required; in addition to the constant round of sowing and reaping, stock-raising and dairying and wholesale housekeeping. Never "*light* house-

keeping." There were no kitchenettes! The wonder was, not that they had little time for the fine arts and music and poetry, but that they really developed such skill in the fine art of living.

The point of all this is the very patent fact that *the family* was once the all-functioning unit of primitive human society; not so much an institution in society as a microcosm, a society in itself. There was nothing necessary it could not or did not do for itself, within the range of its own felt needs. Its wants were kept simple, within the scope of limited means and experience. There must have been many vague hungers in more fastidious hearts; and with our richer life today we wonder how they could possibly have been comfortable or happy. But one does not pine for what one knows naught of, nor really suffer for the lack of undreamed-of comforts. Priscilla Alden never was crazy for a radio or an orthophonic victrola; or simply dying to go to the movie or to hear the vitaphone; or green with jealousy over Mistress Bradford's new Cadillac coupé. She cared more for a grand baby than for a baby grand. She never had the leisure, anyway, for bridge, golf, light opera, or the annual banquet of the collegiate alumnæ, or the convention of the Colonial Dames.

She probably would rather be than see one. She lived sublimely immune to all these future interests of her sadly flustered posterity; and possibly even happier than they, in her simple life of multifold industry.

ALL SOCIAL FUNCTIONS CAME FROM THE HOME

In total ignorance of the future complexities of life and of the comforts and efficiency they incidentally bring, the old-time family met its responsibilities remarkably well. It had to do everything, but it did so philosophically, even stoically, and made little fuss over it. It is worth noting that every other social institution worth having originated in the life of the family; that every function of civilization was in some rudimentary way cradled there. The father was the first priest, as well as the first hunter and fisherman. The mother was the first physician, nurse and teacher, as well as the domesticator of wild animals, including man. The home was the primeval church, the aboriginal school, the primitive workshop and playground, the pristine bank, business office and factory, the first arena, lecture bureau, music hall and library, the first hospital and training school for nurses, the

original hive of industry from which the whole factory system swarmed, and the first complete social center in human history. Within the family was the origin of all government, paternal government. There was the first throne, and, the cynic will add, there was the first battlefield!

But civilization has done something to the home, all-powerful though it used to be. It has broken its social monopoly and persistently redistributed its functions. All the other social institutions have in turn swarmed forth from the family hive, as rising standards of efficiency have demanded further specialization. Thus the home has been set free from one set of burdens after another, as it has passed on one function after another to some specialist better trained or some social agency better qualified to perform them.

SPECIALIZATION SCATTERED THE OLD HOME FUNCTIONS

The steam laundry and the public bakery have not yet conquered the home kitchen in the country village, but they have won their fight in many a city in spite of electric washers and gas and electric ranges. More housewives every year conclude

that it does not pay to bake bread, when machines can do it all, even to the wrapping, without the touch of human hands. And this has been the story, ever since the first artisan with a vision determined to do something better than all his neighbors, be it shoeing a horse, building a shoe, erecting a building, teaching a child, curing the sick or lifting human hearts in the worship of God.

Of course the specialist had to win and the general practitioner lost the practice. Progress required the family medicine-chest to yield to the trained doctor, progress compelled the family teapot bank to resign its contents to the savings bank and deposit vault. Progress made the distaff, spinning wheel and hand loom give way to the mill with ten thousands whirling spindles and ten thousand horse-power engines. Progress required the mother with the horn-book speller and the arithmetic beads to defer to the dame in the dame school, primitive precursor of the trained teachers of today, with their million-dollar educational palaces.

What has been responsible for this increasing specialization, this rising efficiency, and this corresponding loss of functions from the home? Many things, but chiefly new visions, fresh am-

bitions, rising ideals, working out in such familiar social movements as the massing of populations in cities, the invention of machinery, the rise of the factory system, the harnessing of new kinds of power, the emancipation of woman, the discovery of the rights of the child, the increase of wealth and its more general distribution, and the enriching of life and general well-being that has followed in all this remarkable train. There has been much mechanizing, commercializing, but the gains have not by any means all been material. There have been great ideal and spiritual gains, vast cultural, educational and even artistic gains, as civilized life has become richer, fuller, more abundant.

Mahatma Gandhi may have good patriotic reasons for trying to halt the progress of this mechanical age in his own mysterious India by pleading for home industries, the hand-loom and the spinning-wheel; but he has only succeeded in postponing the inevitable, like the poor English weavers who wrecked the original power looms and the journeymen printers who smashed the first linotype. It has been perfectly logical that developing efficiency should increase specialization; and inevitable that this specialization should simplify

the labor and responsibility of the family, as function after function has been passed on to other agencies. Within reasonable limits no one but a confirmed conservative who worships the past could harbor regrets over this remarkable social evolution. It has, to be sure, robbed the home of its monopoly of social functions, but the narrowing of the home program has freed women from much drudgery and has enriched society and made its life far more efficient.

The question is, how much further will this specialization go? Has the home already surrendered functions which it should have retained? Has the ultra-modern home retained sufficient functions to preserve its unity and integrity and justify its own continuance? In fact, will the home as a vital human institution survive, if all its functions save the purely biological be surrendered to other specializing agencies? What is the irreducible minimum of family functions, from the viewpoint of the welfare of children and the ultimate good of the race? From our introductory chapter the reader has already discovered that we anticipated these questions and confessed our fear that this general movement for social efficiency has been guided too much by selfishness rather than

by ideals; that the spiritual interests of children are seriously threatened, and the better home that is to be. Before discussing the problems of the modern family, caught in the maelstrom of these swirling modern forces, we must study a bit more carefully the debt we owe to the homes of our childhood. This will reconstruct our background and clear our perspective.

Chapter IV

Our Debt to the Old Home

One cannot think of this subject without appreciating the sentiment expressed in this quotation from a Cleveland home-lover:

> "What does the old home mean to me? Memories, ever more fondly cherished as the years go by. A beacon light that still softens and lightens the pathway. The mingling fancies of a child's mind with its sunshine and shadows, shaping into threads of character. Ideals of truth, faith and patriotism, these were there; and if these principles at the foundation of the old home can be placed in the foundation of the new home, to me it means that the new home will also stand the tests of time. Around it will also cling those happy dominating influences of life. To some one it will soon be 'The Old Home.' "

As it is certainly true that one can hardly be

a true mother who fails to appreciate her own mother; likewise one who does not appreciate what his boyhood home did for him cannot be a true home-builder. Our estimate of what our present home should be able to accomplish must be derived from the values we have seen and experienced in other homes, especially the home we knew best in our formative years. There is no subject in which deep sentiment appropriately has a larger place. In considering it, we have a right to feel deeply and without reserve. We discount the man who does not. It reflects both upon his home and upon himself. One might well covet, however, the privilege of having his own son, fifty years hence, bear such loving and loyal testimony to the worth of his home as the following quotation expresses:

A TRIBUTE TO AN OLD NEW ENGLAND HOME

"I owe to my early home nearly everything that made my boyhood happy and healthy. In every way it gave me a good start in life. My memories of my father and mother are almost entirely free from regrets or criticisms, so complete was their

sacrificial devotion to their children and their loving care for every detail of the home life. They neither repressed me by Puritan austerity nor spoiled me by lax discipline. They gave me sane, sensible, normal views of life. They stimulated my desire for a good education and helped me to acquire it. They encouraged me in my boyish awkwardness and immaturity to develop what seemed to be very meager talents. They set me noble examples of good citizenship and helpful neighborliness that is the real heart of patriotism. They demonstrated a fine quality of broad, true friendship with all sorts of folks, as well as other substantial character values in a life of industry and efficient living.

"But above all they gave me my first sense of the reality of religion. The atmosphere of the home was such that I sensed this rather than was taught it. It was an inseparable part of my heritage. They must have taught me to pray, but it was earlier than my memory can recall. My father, though an extremely busy man, deep in politics as well as business, and a suburban commuter at that, was faithful to his church and to his home religion. He maintained the custom of

brief family devotions, my mother taking his place in his absence. This had a lasting effect on the children, for we felt that this prayer life was genuine. We well knew that next to their home the first loyalty of our parents was to the church. I realize that my debt to the old home was so great, I was never able to repay my parents for what they did for me. I can only hope to repay them by passing on the blessings of a Christian home to the next generation."

"THE FARM: BEST HOME OF THE FAMILY"

Not all of us were equally fortunate, for the homes of a half-century ago were by no means all alike. Their greater likeness then, however, was due to the fact that all life was simpler, because there were fewer cities and most Americans lived in small communities. So for most of us the old home was the country home, if not the farm home. Though the home described in the above quotation was a village home, there is much to be said for the superiority of the farm as a place for growing children. You may have noticed this remarkable urban tribute to rural life, which is a part of the

inscription cut in stone, over the main entrance to the Washington Union Station:

> THE FARM: BEST HOME OF THE FAMILY
> MAIN SOURCE OF NATIONAL WEALTH
> FOUNDATION OF CIVILIZED SOCIETY
> THE NATURAL PROVIDENCE

It is the city's most eloquent tribute to country life and especially to the farm home.

There are many wretchedly poor homes upon the farm, and very many farm families are now having an economic struggle; but naturally, under normal conditions, there are many factors combining to make the farm a fine background for a growing family, now as well as in former days. The farm home is a human partnership of the most intimate sort, and success upon the farm usually depends upon it. It is a great thing for the father and mother to work together, and to have the whole enterprise center right at home. It is a great thing for every child in the family to take an interest and have a part in this common enterprise. Continuous association with parents in the projects of real living binds the family together and educates the children in a most practical way. No wonder farm children usually show the greatest resourcefulness and originality. There's a reason.

It is rather suggestive that the newer aspects of socialized education and the stress on the project method are but a return to the practical education of farm life that makes country boys and girls able to meet emergencies and share responsibilities. Especially was this true in the past when the farm family not only raised the raw materials but made the finished product in their home industries. The children took a lively interest in helping raise the wool and watching the whole process through to the end till the homespun coat was actually in use.

Speaking of the educational value of thus initiating farm children into the mysteries of the home enterprise, Professor John Dewey says: "We cannot overlook the factors of discipline and character-building involved in all this: training in habits of order and of industry, and in the idea of responsibility, of obligation to do something, to produce something in the world. Personalities which became effective in action were bred and tested in the medium of action." [1] He speaks of the educational importance of thus dealing first-hand with real things and materials, with the actual processes of their manipulation and the knowledge of their

[1] Dewey, J., *School and Society*, p. 23, University of Chicago Press.

social necessities and uses. He refers to the continual training of observation, of ingenuity, of constructive imagination, of logical thought, and of the sense of reality which was sure to be the acquired result of such first-hand contact with actual life in the making.

In pointing out these natural educational advantages in the farm environment, the writer does not wish to be misunderstood as thinking that we must all return to the farm in order to educate our children adequately! The trend to the *suburbs* is a very wise movement for families with children; but a "back to the farm movement" would now be quite foolish, for we still have too many farmers. Due to over-production, the farm population has continued to decrease astonishingly the past half-decade, and this trend must still continue. Too many people are trying to make a living from the soil. Increasingly efficient machinery and more intensive methods of agriculture have been increasing food production faster than the growth of population.

But our point here is exactly what Dewey emphasized in the above quotation. There were values in the old-time home, still existing in the farm homes today, that must somehow be secured

for the benefit of our modern children, now that so many of us are obliged to live in cities. Many city parents living in crowded apartments wish that they could provide for their children the chance to develop self-reliance that farm life so surely offers. The compact city home, so perfect in its appointments, has eliminated almost every possible task for the children. The janitor robs them of their training and steals their father's exercise! There is seldom even a wood-box to be filled. The gas fireplace fills it for keeps. The family has nothing to do with the paternal business except to spend the money it makes. It is doubtful if they really know how the money is made or what the business is all about. Lacking home tasks and the chance to use their hands, the son and daughter have to go to summer camps to get back to simple life and learn a little of what the farm home taught their parents.

THE OLD-TIME FAMILY UNITY AND LOYALTY

Until recent years all the practical benefits of the farm home characterized most of the homes of the past. And it is worth noting that the farm home set the pace for the rest. Civilization was

not yet urbanized. Even in the towns the whole family regularly lived, ate and worshipped together, usually worked together and sometimes played together, making a strong unity in the household. The much higher birth-rate and the larger families made a better socialized group. They did not have to cross the street to borrow brothers and sisters. They learned the fine art of getting along with people, because the inevitable life-sharing of a large family, the give-and-take of brothers and sisters and cousins, the mutual concessions of many minds under one roof were powerful character developers.

This was before the scattering of our families to the four winds and the thirty-two points of the compass. In those days relatives were many and usually near. It was the day of the gathering of the clans at the great Thanksgiving dinners, the summer picnics, the Christmas festivals, the barn-raisings, the corn-huskings. Family spirit, clan spirit, neighborhood spirit all ran high and thrived on their frequent expression. There was a loyalty to family that was more than pride. It was rooted in the depth and the breadth and the constancy of family associations in a group that did everything in life together. Because of the com-

pleteness of their self-sufficiency, they were less dependent upon outsiders. Thus the family became mutually dependent in a little world of their own, in a patriarchal society in which the father's will was law.

The schools and churches and the limited circles of work and play divided very little the interests of the various members of the household; it was a strongly *home-centered* life. There were few exclusive clubs or orders to make life centrifugal. The home suffered nothing from social competition. No other institution could compete with it for the love and loyalty of either young folks or old. Instead of "stepping out" for fun, they brought their fun home with them. In such capacious kitchens and parlors there was room for all. Human interests were narrower and less varied, so each was interested in the interests of all, and they worked and played and lived together.

Many of these old-time homes were positively religious. Though a smaller percentage of people were members of churches, that membership evidently meant more than it often does today. In the homes that claimed to be religious, it was seldom a formality. Oftener the home religion was intensely sincere, frank and undoubting, leaving

a positive stamp upon the children. In such homes religion was neither a life elective nor a luxury, but was a prime necessity. Faith in God and in prayer was very real, though the transcendent God of the Calvinist seemed very far away. The church was their first loyalty outside the home and family prayers proved the reality of the father's faith and established religion in the home as the supreme interest in life.

UNDESIRABLE FEATURES OF OLD-TIME HOME

It is sufficiently clear that most of us owe a lasting debt to our old homes. Yet few of us would duplicate those homes today, even if we could, for we know the old home had its weaknesses as well as its strength. Fairness compels us to confess that we would not go back to exactly our childhood home conditions, even if we could take with us our electricity and replace the old gray mare with the new sedan. It is not a personal criticism to say that the old home was too austere and parent-centered, for that was the spirit of the age, and in fact of all previous history. The old home was no democracy. It was a monarchy, with parental authority too absolute. In most homes the father's

will was dominant; though skillful mothers often got their way by subtle diplomacy. The personality of children was not honored. They were loved but hardly regarded as persons. "Children's rights" were never dreamed of. They had no rights before the law. They had duties instead, and were often reminded of them. The child's need of normal play is a recent discovery. In the old days it was quite unknown. In Puritan homes play was considered a temptation of Satan and at least a waste of time. So they were kept busy to keep them out of mischief, being often reminded that "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do." There was too much work as a deliberate substitute for play. In many homes there was considerable repression of the child's natural, instinctive desire for freedom, fun, and physical activity. The need of purely childlike expression and youthful experience was little understood. It was certainly an adult's world.

There was complete failure to appreciate that a child's religious needs were quite different from his parents'. Sunday services were seldom adapted to children, though the children were expected to attend and to listen to what they could not possibly understand. The Puritan Sabbath in many

homes was uninteresting, tedious and gloomy, with little to relieve the gloom for children. The old-time religion was too doctrinal and theological, hence quite out of the reach of the youthful; and it appealed too strongly to fear, which was a positive cruelty to tender and sensitive souls, young or old.

That rebellion was not more frequent against this religion of fear, this strenuous Puritanism and rigid home discipline, is proof of the sheer goodness of the well-meaning parents who were doing as well as they knew, and thus held the confidence and love of their children in spite of everything. It is doubtful, however, if in many Puritan homes their love was really warmer than a cool respect, for sometimes any expression of love was discouraged. Even in middle-class families it was too commonly the custom for the children to be exploited as an economic asset of the home. The law allowed them to be "bound out to service till they were one-and-twenty," the father pocketing the profits of their unrequited labor. It was this kind of father, still surviving in the twentieth century, who protested against the draft in 1917, saying, "I don't want my son to be drafted for the army. *I raised him for my own use.*" It is all

too evident that the old-time home, especially as long ago as seventy years, was a parental tyranny. It was usually a benevolent despotism, but a tyranny none the less.

It is fortunately true that in the modern family of the intelligent type today, many of these Puritan emphases have been quietly outgrown. We are glad that we have lost the Puritan Sabbath and have in its place a Christian Sunday which was really "made for man." We are glad that the suppression of childhood in the parent-centered home has decidedly waned and with it the arbitrary parental authority requiring unreasoning, instant obedience. We are glad that emphasis on doctrinal formulas, creeds and catechisms is passing; that the religion of fear has gone bankrupt, and that God's love now reigns. With these humanizing trends in recent decades, the modern family has corrected the austerity of the Puritan past which fairness compelled us to recall. And we can easily overlook these human failings when we remember the strength of purpose, the nobility of ideals, the conscientiousness and self-sacrifice of our fathers and mothers and grandparents. There were permanent values in those old-time homes that the world must not lose, values for the building of

character, for training the human spirit in ways of noble and efficient living, that are too precious to forget or overlook in our planning for the better home that is to be.

THE MYSTERIOUS CHARM OF AN OLD COLONIAL HOUSE

Before we pass on to a study of the modern home, with all its pristine, self-conscious newness, its complicated conveniences, its complacent inventions, its social and educational novelties, and its harvest of difficult problems, let us make the newcomer wait a bit with becoming patience while we think of the unrivaled and unique charm of the grand old Colonial mansion, resting in quiet dignity beneath its century-old elms.

AN OLD HOUSE
HAS AN ATMOSPHERE WHICH
CANNOT BE CARRIED INTO A NEW HOUSE

THE WALLS HAVE HEARD VOICES
NOW LONG SILENT
THE HALLS HAVE ECHOED FOOTFALLS
NO LONGER AUDIBLE

THE ROOF HAS PROTECTED
A RICH AND VARIED LIFE

OUR DEBT TO THE OLD HOME

OF JOY AND SORROW, OF WORK AND REST
WHICH HAS PASSED ON LIKE A RIVER
INTO OTHER COUNTRIES
AND FLOWS ON UNDER OTHER TREES
AND SKIES

BUT THIS VANISHED LIFE HAS
LEFT ITS IMPRESS
ON THE OLD HOUSE, HAS HUMANIZED IT
AND OVERLAID IT WITH
ALL MANNER OF SACRED ASSOCIATIONS
SO THAT IN A VERY REAL WAY
THE OLD LIFE GOES ON WITHIN
THE WALLS, AND KEEPS THE OLD HOUSE
STILL AN OLD HOME [1]

[1] Authorship unknown. Found engrossed on old parchment and framed, in the delightful old home of Mr. George Stewart in Norwalk, Ohio.

Chapter V

Our Obligation to Maintain a Home

Whatever we may owe the old home, our debt is not only or chiefly to the past. A recent stimulating book by Dr. John Finley, with the title, *The Debt Eternal*, says little of the past but confronts the future. In the author's opinion the "eternal debt" of humanity is not our debt to parents, but the duty of parents to their children, to maintain a real home and to guarantee the well-being of the next generation. Adult men and women split on this rock into two hopelessly hostile camps. You either regard the welfare of your children as the supreme purpose of your home, or you do not. Either you make self-interest primary and live selfishly, self-indulgently, or you live like a Christian, subordinating self-interest to the welfare of the home group. Is the home for the child or for the selfish pleasure of the parents? In fact, the ultra-modern are raising the

still more elementary question, Why maintain a home at all? Why marry? And even if married, "Let's board around and play around awhile. Why bother with a home?"

THE FUTILE HOST OF MARRIAGE SLACKERS

More than one-fourth of the white men of the United States between the ages of twenty-five and forty-four, inclusive, are not married.[1] Not all can be called marriage slackers. Some seem to be born bachelors, some acquire bachelorhood and others have the lonely estate thrust upon them. But there are few good reasons for a man's refusing the obligations of marriage. Now that women have the ballot, no one could blame them if they should join with married men in taxing bachelors; for it is obvious that a healthy bachelor is deliberately avoiding his share of the world's responsibilities and setting an example which would soon destroy the race.

Contrary to general opinion, the census shows a decreasing percentage of unmarried men ever since 1890. But this is partly due to a notable

[1] There were, in 1920, 3,665,094 white bachelors in this country. See *Fourteenth Census of the United States*, vol. ii, p. 388.

increase in the present generation in opportunities for women's work outside the home, and the custom of continuing this work after marriage.[1] The large majority of families today are certainly not supported by the father's wage alone; but among the professional and business classes where the former prejudice against the wife's wage-earning still prevails, the age at marriage is probably higher than formerly. Marriage is being postponed by the upper-middle class, with consequences that are notoriously unfortunate. Were it not for the increasing opportunities for married women in industry, and the increasing favor with which such work is regarded by most social groups, the percentage of marriage-slackers would be vastly larger. In fact, at our present scale of comfortable and even luxurious living, it would be impossible for the majority to maintain a home at all without the wife's wages.

The so-called American scale of living is being sustained at the cost of women's labor outside the home. Many feel this is too high a price to pay for our luxury of being the most comfortable people on the planet. Others reply that women

[1] To support this opinion, see Dublin, L. I., *Population Problems*, p. 237. Houghton Mifflin Company.

work as hard as men in all other lands and do rougher work than in America, which is undoubtedly true. If the United States has any claim whatever to be maintaining a superior civilization, it would be on the ground that our women have the greatest opportunity and independence on earth. Certainly American women are the envy of the women of the world. Yet he is a poor American, and a poor observer, who can return from travels abroad without a feeling that our women can stand every comparison, and that they have proved themselves worthy in every respect of the complete equality, social, political and economic, which they have won in this land. Let it be recognized that in this matter of home-making they are fully maintaining their share in the partnership with men, and doing it in this generation as never before, so far as actual wage-earning is concerned. And yet there are bachelors still, millions of them! And plenty of slackers refusing even to found a home.

WHAT ABOUT THE BACHELOR MAIDS?

But the home slackers are certainly not all men. Our cities are swarming with deliberate spinsters

who are too selfish to marry.[1] When bachelors are taxed, they will be taxed too, or all the jilted men will "turn state's evidence"! There are two sides to the question, however. It is obvious that since women have won economic independence and equal chance for education, marriage for a meal ticket has gone out of fashion. Men are not yet adjusted to this, but they will have to recognize that marriage as an institution is suffering from competition. It no longer enjoys its historical advantage of a monopoly. At last there are other careers for women. Women who marry now marry from choice. Hitherto men have made married life mean whatever they wished to make it. Now they must raise the standard and make marriage fair to women or still more men will wait long and search far for brides. This is surely a wholesome trend and will produce better families. To the extent that intelligent, capable, self-sustaining women are scrutinizing men more cautiously and raising the passing-mark for bridegrooms, we can

[1] In spite of all the "war brides" in 1916-18, the number of unmarried white women aged twenty to thirty-four years, of native parentage, shows a very slight proportionate decrease in 1920, as compared with the previous census (see U. S. Census for 1920, vol. ii, p. 392). More than one-sixth of the white American women between twenty-five and forty-four years were single in 1920 (see vol. ii, p. 388, of the Census).

not criticize but must praise them for their wise caution. More damaged goods have been palmed off on innocent, gullible women in the matrimonial market than in any other market in the world.

Wariness, however, on the part of the cautious spinsters does not tell the whole story. This alone cannot account for the fact that it takes three graduates of Bryn Mawr to produce one child, or five of the honor scholars of Wellesley—so many of them never marry.[1] A majority of the women graduates of some coeducational universities ultimately marry; but this is not true of any of the separate women's colleges of the East, or even the "coeds" of Stanford and Syracuse, a majority of whom are not married. Most of these superior women are, of course, unmarried from choice. They have high standards and prefer to wait rather than marry a man who fails to meet these standards. Meanwhile they prosper in the careers for which they trained themselves. One ventures to wonder, though, if their critical judgment of men is not too exacting, and their spurning marriage is not just as selfish and anti-social as the conduct and motive of the complacent bachelor.

[1] For the data cited in this paragraph, see Popenoe, Paul, *The Conservation of the Family*, p. 129. Williams & Wilkins.

One feels real sympathy for the well-educated woman who seeks an equally intelligent mate. Mental sympathy is a large element in happy marriage. But equal attainment in the same lines is never essential in marriage, provided each possesses something of high value in mind and character and talent which the other can honor and be really proud of. It is better to complement than closely match each other. Many women college graduates are now happily married to non-college men who are proud of the wife's keen intelligence, and in turn hold the wife's high respect for their fine business talent and high character. There must be, however, these mutual compensations to justify such a marriage and make it happily successful.

But after all possible allowances are made for women of superior education and talent, we are obliged to admit that there is a growing problem in the selfish unwillingness of women to marry. Excessive individualism is of course to blame for it. In most cases that tells the whole story. Such women are having too good a time as independent bachelor maids, with a minimum of responsibilities of any sort, to settle down to being any man's wife. Not that they couldn't manage their husbands.

Doubtless most of them have no such inferiority complex! But marriage means responsibilities, and they are wary. It used to be said, "Men lose their independence in marriage, but women find theirs." This wise saw is seldom heard today, for the contrast is disappearing in the modern, equal-partnership marriage, as it should. Rather do they now find that mutual dependence which deepens love and brings a richer life to both. Our marriage slackers, male or female, are defrauding society, but like all other parasites, they are cheating themselves most of all.

WHEN MARRIAGE DOES NOT MEAN A HOME

But it is one thing to marry and supposably found a home, and quite another to maintain one. It is rather evident that numerous applicants for marriage certificates at the city clerk's office have no real intention of maintaining a home at all. Children are a remote contingency, to be postponed as long as possible. And even a permanent abode is undesired, much less a home of their own. In fact, the whole affair is quite tentative, with friendly divorce a possible issue, unless the companionship should prove to be a success and a

real necessity—about which both they and their friends are none too optimistic. It is not safe to assume it, for it remains to be proved. Nothing could be further from the solemn dignity of the old-time marriage, or in fact of the true Christian marriage today, in which permanency is assumed as a matter of course and the maintaining of a home the definite objective.

What accounts for this astounding difference in attitude? Pure selfishness, individualism gone mad. Self-indulgent children, accustomed always to make "a good time" their chief end in life, naturally make self-indulgent wives and husbands, determined to let nothing interfere with their personal pleasure. Responsibilities of any sort are shunned. Even marriage itself is frankly an experiment. Responsibilities are inconvenient killjoys, to be endured only when they produce income. Hence the large irresponsible group of young married floaters, in our cities and suburbs, who marry thoughtlessly, live frivolously, play around rather promiscuously, spend recklessly and move annually or even oftener. With no more roots than an airplane, they are essentially anti-social, avoiding most of the attachments and responsibilities of real citizenship. They are valueless to any

community, mere spenders and wasters. They just add to the scenery. It is time they grew up, settled down and began to take life seriously, instead of regarding it as one big amusement park, run for their childish pleasure. Such drifters are a liability, not an asset, to any community; poor stuff out of which to build a nation. Only home-builders can really build anything. Married bachelors and bachelor maids are poor substitutes for parents as community builders.

WHEN TWO PLUS ONE MAKES MORE THAN THREE

Countless drifters like these, however, in spite of their own selfish planning, have found the coming of the first baby, though grossly unwelcome, the salvation of their quasi-home and the real cause of its permanence. Until the child anchors it to foundations, the ultra-modern home is just on skids. But by a wonderful providence, the mystical experience of parenthood often deepens the shallow natures of our young people and reveals to them something of the real meaning of life. Tardy discovery, it is none the less redemptive. Many a modern young mother finds a surprising joy in her new dignity, that makes the tin-

sel of her former frivolities seem utterly cheap and tawdry. She finds reality in motherhood and something of the beauty of sacrifice, till lesser joys lose their fascination. Perhaps she has found her *soul*. At least she and her comrade in the strange new experience have found the reason for maintaining a home, a permanent home. They acknowledge their debt to the future, quit the butterfly life, settle down to the sober business of real living, and plan for a long journey together. Two plus one makes more than three, when the one is a baby! It makes a real home. It is the child that makes the family, and thus it has been from the beginning.

Chapter VI

The City Home's Struggle for Survival

The home in the country is still reasonably secure, but the modern home in crowded cities is struggling for survival. Our specialized age has taken from it so many of its functions, it has left it strangely bereft, though very complacent about it. Homespun functions have fled in this electric age, for it is the day of the radio, the airplane and television, not the day of the distaff and the spinning-wheel—and what a transformation this symbolizes!

In a supposedly rising civilization, one function after another has escaped from the city home, until often only the shell of a social institution remains, just a place to eat and sleep, more or less regularly, and even the eating is extremely modern. With the advent of public bakeries and delicatessen shops, the vast kitchens of our grandmothers, with their capacious ovens, have shrunk into the in-

significance of our apartment kitchenettes, mere culinary toys by comparison.

Home laundries and sewing-rooms have disappeared from these modern urban homes, for obvious reasons; likewise the nursery and the library, the playroom and the workshop. All crowded out by the sheer cost of space and by the modern efficiency which has developed specialized agencies to attend to these functions outside. To be sure, most of these changes we welcome as signs of progress. They have set free many hands from many home cares and former duties; but whether for better or worse is not always quite clear. It can be and should be decidedly for the better.

THE MODERN CENTRIFUGAL FAMILY

And so it has come about that many of these non-functioning homes are little better than boarding-houses, on an expensive scale; and how can anyone really love a boarding-house? In the process of transformation, of modernization, the old institution of the family has lost some precious values. In the industrialized home, from which all but the young children go to work at different

tasks, and in the ultra-fashionable home in which all make hard work of their play and are slaves to society, the losses are strangely similar. The family group has suffered the loss of unity, coherence and group loyalty which can only grow out of common interests and mutual activities. The members of such a family seldom do anything together any more, and naturally their interests are as diverse as their scattered activities. Like any boarding-house, *such homes have become centrifugal.* They have become decentralized; the vital interests of the individual members of the family are elsewhere—at their shop counters, their machines, their offices, their clubs, their golf links, their factories or banks, or back of the wheel of the roving six. Obviously the life of such ultra-modern families is no longer home-centered. Home is no longer a mystic shrine, a focus of deep loyalty and love; but just a place to get away from on schedule time, and to straggle back to tardily when necessity for sleep compels. Can such a denatured home really survive? That is yet to be proved. Experience is too short yet to determine. But such decentralized families in city flats, tenements, apartments or palaces are just now having a real

struggle for survival. Sometimes the struggle is a listless, hopeless and even carelessly indifferent one. In other homes it is a genuine struggle, a fight against the trend, against the tide, an honest effort to meet the modern difficulties and somehow to save from the wreck some of the precious values of the beloved old home of the past.

THE SOCIAL COMPLEX OF THE URBAN HOME

This brings us to the point in our survey of modern family conditions that calls for an analysis of the social complex. Let us try to list the chief difficulties involved in the reconstruction of the modern urban home as it struggles with its problem of survival. There are ten or twelve distinct elements in the complex tangle, together constituting, doubtless, the most complicating and baffling domestic situation human society has ever had to wrestle with. Yet it is a fascinating situation, and not necessarily a discouraging one, for it is not the result of decadence, but of that rapid expansion of forces and resources that we call civilization, the cost of which is greater social complexity.

There emerges first the *space* problem, the diffi-

culty of housing the family, in the midst of city congestion, in a really human way. This problem was a child of the slums, but, unfortunately, did not stay there. It now threatens the comfort, the efficiency and the morals of most city homes. Next comes the *time* problem, the difficulty of conflicting schedules in an industrialized family whose members are all slaves to the alarm-clock, the whistle and the bell, for their study, work or fun. This too frequently breaks the unity of the family life into the confusion of a "staggered" schedule. The problem of *resources* will always be with us, the difficulty of adequate income, but only recently has it involved both sexes as wage-earners, with the resulting social complications.

Very vital in our discussion is the problem of *a home-centered life*. To a degree this is concerned with the actual survival of the family itself, at least along the lines of Christian ideals. The centrifugal family means a disintegrating home, and we see this process going on around us at an alarming rate. Acute in very many homes is the *new discipline problem*. This has come from the general slump in authority and the craze for independence and self-expression. The project prob-

lem of *work and play*, a simple one in rural homes, has become very serious in congested city homes, whether rich or poor. There are many other *educational* problems, but this is the initial one and fundamentally serious. For all ambitious families the problem of *social competition* involves the home in a constant "keeping up with the Joneses," that causes much strain, discontent and unhappiness, most of which is foolish and futile, but it has to be reckoned with. Increasingly serious are the problems of moral standards, freshly complicated by *ever-changing social ideals* and by what we naïvely style the youth movement and by newly won feminine freedom. Deeply involved here and causing increasing trouble are the *problems of sex* and delayed marriage. Increasing divorce, however unfortunate, is not regarded as a problem in itself, for it is more accurately a symptom of a deeper family disease and is a result more than a cause of trouble. Ultimately we come, and with a deepening sense of their unique importance, to the *religious problems* of the family, involving religious nurture on the one hand and religious reconstruction on the other. We shall come to this final discussion with the conviction that religion is still, as it always has been, the greatest stabilizer

of the family, without which the complex social problem of the home is hopelessly serious.

SPACE FOR A HOME: THE CITY HOUSING PROBLEM

With the enormous rise in rents since the war, the space problem has become universal in the city and congestion is no longer confined to the slums. The working girl, unable to pay more than half the rent of an attic room, and bankrupted if she loses her pal, knows the tragedy of it; but all others feel the pressure, in varying degrees. When the end of the war found most cities five years behind their local building program, and the exorbitant costs of construction delayed home-building even longer, countless families were forced to crowd into less space than they had ever been accustomed to before. Inevitably the cultural level of such homes was lowered, for human life in groups requires space to be decent, or a home becomes a warren, and civilization sags. The ratio of rooms to people is a fairly good index to a family's level of civilized living. There's a vast difference between two homes, one of which has twelve rooms for three people, and the other twelve people to three rooms. A family's lack of space

for a real home means danger to health, happiness, efficiency, morals, family stability and even life itself, whether they are positively poor or just lazy and niggardly.

These dangers in the crowded home are fairly well understood. Mangold says, "Investigators have made quite plain the effects of overcrowding. The mortality of a population increases as the density per acre increases. Mortality varies inversely according to the number of rooms per apartment. English figures have shown that the one-room apartment is nearly twice as fatal as the four-room apartment. It is especially under such conditions that a large infant mortality ensues, because it becomes impossible to provide the child with a sufficient amount of nature's curative forces and properties." [1] Delinquency of children is also quite in proportion to the family crowding, also the death of the home ideals and the general sagging of the spiritual and cultural levels of the family. All this has long been true, but only recently has this slum problem of lack of respectable space affected so generally our middle-class city-dwellers, because of the exorbitant prices of rent.

[1] Mangold, G. B., *Problems of Child Welfare*, p. 108. The Macmillan Company, publishers.

The drift of city families into apartments has continued steadily since the war. The Bureau of Labor's investigations in 257 cities show that whereas 58.3 per cent of city families in 1921 lived in separate homes, and 17.3 per cent in two-family houses, in 1928 only 38.3 per cent were living in single, and 13.4 per cent in double houses; while the proportion living in apartments has doubled, rising from 24.4 per cent to 48.3 per cent in seven years.[1] The strong trend to the suburbs seems to be taking the larger families, but the smaller families prefer apartment life, and altogether too many families have learned the questionable art of condensed living. The hall bedroom, the collapsible day bed and the "breakfast nook" euphemism are here to stay, and the tenement couch which hardly rests between day and night shifts is still a menace. Space costs so terribly, every square foot is counted. This was always true among the poor. The new symptom is the fact that it now prevails throughout the city middle class.

Space is the base-line problem in which nearly every other family problem takes root. The reconstruction of a normal home requires breathing

[1] *Bureau of Labor Bulletin,* July 1928.

space, room to be healthy and decent, room to sleep with self-respect, play room, room for friends, courting room, room for the quiet solitude which restores sanity, poise and courage, room to prepare real meals and serve them hospitably, room for a true hearthstone, a social center where a scattered family may find happiness together once more.

Without more space, what hope of survival in a real home has the crowded city family? Unquestionably the lack of it is a prime factor in the nervous tension, the irritability, the growing impatience and incompatibility which head straight for divorce and broken homes. It is quite conceivable that *one more room*, 150 square feet of blessed, costly space, would be the saving of a bickering, nerve-wracked family. But it requires no imagination to see the necessary cost of this extra space go glimmering every month for new silk stockings, just because skirts are sixteen inches from the ground instead of six!

Of course it is obvious that the space difficulty bears down hardest on the children and the birth-rate. It oppresses the former and depresses both to the vanishing point. Children have a way of asserting their rights to space, to the embarrass-

ment of parents and the disgust of neighbors; and, like all other varieties of pain, this is a danger-signal which should be heeded. This is doubtless the chief irritant which is causing the remarkable exodus from city to suburb and village today. It is a sign of returning human sanity that the heart of great cities has ceased to grow. Manhattan Borough in New York City showed a good healthy loss at the last census,[1] and all its high schools except the Haaren School on Sixty-fourth Street were in 1927 steadily losing enrollment, because of the continuous trekking of families with children out to the suburbs. This single exception is a school for working boys and girls on an alternating, half-time schedule. It was founded and is still skillfully supervised by Principal R. Wesley Burnham.

THE NOTABLE GROWTH OF SUBURBAN HOMES

In Chicago also there is a strong movement away from the crowded "cliff-dwellers" apartments. In January, 1928, the South End Public

[1] Most people are surprised to discover that Manhattan Borough, New York City, lost 386,513 people between 1910 and 1925. The census reported 2,331,542 in 1910; 2,284,103 in 1920; and 1,945,029 in 1925 (state census). U. S. Census Bureau estimates (1928) still further loss of over 200,000. Thus since 1920 a city larger than Buffalo has moved out of old New York into the suburbs.

School Association in that city, an influential organization with 7,000 members, passed a set of vigorous resolutions from which the following is abridged:

> "Be it resolved, that granting that the Cook County Federation of Women's Organizations, reporting investigations by Mrs. Schwartz and Miss Bonford, is correct in the statement that 'girls and boys as young as fifteen are indulging in promiscuous living and drinking, due to the lack of homes adequate to the needs of youth,' we urge that all our members who are parents living in kitchenette apartments, presumably for economic reasons, but in reality because of the inconvenience of home-making in a cottage home or bungalow, thus lessening the free hours that the woman who is an apartment dweller devotes to club life, *be urged to become home owners* for the sake of the younger generation in order to give their children real home life, not enjoyed by the modern cliff dweller. . . ." [1]

In most of our cities similar conditions exist and

[1] From a personal letter from the vice-president of the association.

the phenomenal growth of suburbs everywhere near large towns is the answer. And so this interesting paradox is happening on a nation-wide scale. The city home's struggle for survival is finding victory in retreat! It is saving its life, its unity, its happiness by quitting as a city home and changing its flat for a bungalow. In this "Blessed Land of Room Enough," as Van Dyke calls America, what folly for our homes to be literally squeezed to death for lack of space for wholesome living! For tens of thousands of families, rapid transit and commuting are saving the day.

City families that still resist the suburban trend are obliged to face the space problem squarely, if they would keep their homes from gradual but sure disintegration. As the family increases, are you able to add sufficient space to your apartment to provide adequately for the growing family's living needs? If not, then you are paying too high a price for the doubtful luxury of the city's bright lights and social whirl. You could own your own home, with ample space, a fair chance for the children, and the joy of real neighbors in some quiet suburb, for the exorbitant cost of inadequate rent which robs both the purse and the family welfare. The time is approaching when few will live in indus-

trial centers except the unfortunates who are compelled to. Home life is finer, roomier and richer away from the smoke and the noise. And the decentralizing trend in industry, already gaining promising headway, may go so far ultimately as to provide decent space for the homes of wage-earners.

In the industrialized home the *time* problem is far less serious than the space problem, but the competing schedules of various members of the family sadly break up the family unity, especially when some are on night shifts. In countless homes, breakfast as a group function seems to have gone forever. Instead of the whole family circle breakfasting together and starting the day normally and thankfully with a family prayer, the morning meal is merely a sketchy, tandem, perpendicular affair, when not cut entirely. Then all scatter for the day. Dinner at night is *the* family meal now, for as many as find it convenient when outside engagements allow. Supper, if any, is a midnight lunch, though seldom domestic, and then out of the frigidaire. This time-difficulty scatters the family, and of course, the well-being of children suffers in many subtle ways. School schedules and industrial schedules seldom synchronize. Hence the increas-

ing vogue of the city school luncheon and cafeteria. Modern city life trains children to get along as well as they can without their parents (and the reverse), and makes them mature too fast.

THE PROBLEM OF A HOME-CENTERED LIFE

In any list of home problems, the problem of resources, of adequate income, must of course be mentioned. It will be passed over here, as this is not a book on economics. Incidentally this and the other problems listed above will be considered in later chapters. The problem of *a home-centered life* is, however, one of the chief social problems of the family. It is now at the very heart of the city home's struggle for survival. We have already traced the trends which have made the city home centrifugal and destroyed the family unity. Too frequently the family's main interests center quite outside the home. If this disintegrating tendency, which threatens the permanence of the Christian family, is to be halted, we must discover how to make city life home-centered again. Given a strong enough purpose, a persistent desire, this can be accomplished. But not without the unselfish determination to build the home life around the wel-

fare of children, as the resolutions quoted above from Chicago so pointedly suggest.

It is a rather gruesome fact that in many cities the cemeteries are obliged to close at twilight, because of the increasing custom of young people in couples to frequent them. *The Cleveland Plain Dealer* for July 10, 1928, reports this custom as very general, and laments the fact that young people are compelled to go to such extremes to be together at the courting period, because their own homes have crowded them out. This paper quotes the secretary of the Association of American Cemetery Superintendents as saying: "Prevention of petting in cemeteries has become a national problem. Cemeteries all over the country are troubled with the same situation. In Pittsburgh, as in other cities, we have been compelled to close our gates to automobiles at 5.30 P.M. to cope with this condition." The dangerous isolation of automobile "twosing," whether driving in the park or parking in the drive, is another serious symptom of alarming prevalence. Both parents and police are at their wits' ends over this problem; but the young people cannot be blamed when the family does not provide courting opportunities at home.

The home must be made attractive and useful to

youth. No wonder the nine boys in a certain New England family, one after another, about all went to the devil. They had always been allowed the freedom of the kitchen, dining-room, and woodshed. Another family, infinitely wiser, fitted up a gymnasium in the attic to keep their boys at home, and went without new parlor furniture. Many shrewd parents have introduced dark-rooms for young photographers, workshops for young carpenters, bug-rooms for young naturalists, music-rooms for budding musicians, noisome "stink-rooms" for blundering chemists, and even mush-rooms in the cellar, and so on through the whole fad chapter. These schemes are certainly worth the outlay when they help the young folks to like their home, stay at home, and invite their friends there. Why not make the home a place where the young folks like to be and where they know they and their friends are wanted? If this were universal in our city homes, as it usually is in the country, we should hear little more of the "revolt of youth." Safed the Sage says: "There is nothing new about this revolt of youth. Youth has been in revolt ever since Adam and Eve raised Cain." However, they never have had better reason for revolting than in the homes where self-indulgent

parents reverse nature and selfishly limit the home to adult interests.

It is worth careful notice that Jesus' ideal of the Kingdom of God, his better world that is to be, is home-centered. That Kingdom of God's good will can never come until we restore the home as the real center of life. This decentralizing of the interests of the family group must stop. There must be more home-centered fellowship for the entire family, more family recreation, more sharing of life, cost what it may in sacrifice of selfish interests of the father, mother and older children. This will require more space than the present congested flats and apartments provide; and it will require revision of the complicated time schedules in many homes, with family welfare and efficiency in mind, instead of money and other selfish motives.

Recent years have seen some gains worth mentioning in this connection, though they have mostly been in comparatively poor families. With the closing of the saloon, "the poor man's club," many men have become less selfish in their recreations and now rather frequently take the whole family for an outing, an evening at the movies, a holiday at the beach, a Saturday picnic, and especially a little journey in the Ford or the Chevrolet. That

this is a very wholesome change is perfectly apparent, and one very important phase of it is the sharing of life with the whole family. Many families on this social level have more fellowship and more good times together than ever in the past, and far more than many wealthier families, even though too little of it is actually home-centered. It may well be questioned whether the segregated men's clubs and fraternal orders for men only are as popular as a few years past. At least the mutual orders for men and women together have gained relatively in strength—though this gain has been partly at the expense of home loyalty.

It is probably in the well-to-do homes that we find the greatest need of more home-centered fellowship. Here the fewness of the children makes the problem much more difficult and the family circle has to be widened frequently to include congenial neighbors. This common practice has developed in many delightful suburbs a new neighborliness which is as fine as in the old-time country home. In the city, however, little progress is evident in this regard. Here is one of the persistent needs of the city family, if it shall win in its struggle for survival. It too frequently deserves

the unenviable title, the *non-functioning home.* If it is to survive, it must be made to function.

RECLAIM THE NON-FUNCTIONING HOME

The non-functioning family must rediscover and recover its necessary functions. Fathers and mothers must assume again some of the duties they have been selfishly avoiding. They must again face their share of responsibility for the social, educational, moral and religious welfare of their children, in spite of all the difficulties involved. Whatever specialists they may have employed to share these responsibilities, they should check up on the whole process themselves, and more of it should actually be done in the home, so that the life of the children shall be more home-centered, with resulting gains in love for parents and home loyalty. One supreme function must at all hazards be retained or regained by the home, the essential formation of character, in its beautiful fundamentals. It is fatal for the home to surrender this God-given right and burden. That home has clearly failed which has not endowed its children with the four great moral safeguards of life: self-control, self-respect, a sense of honor and the spirit of chivalry.

The sons of true homes, who have acquired at home these great essentials, are knights of the true nobility. That family will surely survive that can leave upon its children the impress of its own moral and spiritual ideals, whether or not it leaves them any other bequest.

But if the city home fails, in its present struggle for survival, what will become of the family? Companionate marriage offers a *substitute* for the family, and the present trend is in that direction. But it is at best only a poor imitation; *for two persons living together frankly on a trial basis, and merely for selfish companionship, and by contract excluding children, are founding neither a home nor a family. They have simply formed a social partnership in supreme selfishness.*

Chapter VII

The New Status of Woman and Its Consequences

It has too long been a man's world. Perhaps not always, for there are interesting echoes, rather ominous to male ears, echoes of a matriarchate, an Amazon age here and there in barbarous days when wild women ruled. And women have often enjoyed the empty honor of reigning instead of ruling. It is an easy substitute, and something of an anesthetic. We need not recall the huge hoax of medieval chivalry, by which the dominant males kept woman passively subservient and dependent, by yielding her, with many a graceful flourish masking a smile, an extravagant sentimental homage, while leaving her hopelessly bound by taboos. It was fake reverence, a colossal ruse and conspiracy by the entire male sex! For in all material matters man treated woman as his inferior, and was strong enough to maintain it by brute force.

Hence man-made laws and man-made courts which perpetuated a man's world, while woman remained a slave, a chattel, a toy, a tournament queen, an ignorant drudge or an angel—but ever something less than a person or the true equal of man.

But now in the new age the world is no longer man's "oyster." A new status has been won by woman. And it is an interesting and vital question, How is this new status of woman affecting the family? There can be no doubt that it is affecting it. It is important to discover how. Perhaps the most significant recent influence molding the American home, even more radically than the youth movement, or the new suburban trend, or even the multiplication of apartments, is this new status of woman. It is a phenomenon of the first rank, modifying every possible relationship from motherhood down. The political, educational, economic, and social status of woman have all advanced so suddenly and so remarkably as to make this passing generation unique in human history. Never in any two centuries have women made so much progress as in this single generation. The woman's movement has been an age-long struggle for the recognition of her complete personality before the law and before the reluctant court of

male public opinion. No credit to the men of the past that it took nineteen Christian centuries to accomplish it.

WHAT DIFFERENCE HAS THE FRANCHISE MADE?

The recently won political status, giving woman essentially equal rights with man in our organic law, and especially the right of franchise, came so suddenly and so recently, we have hardly sensed yet its full significance. Men had long resisted it and ridiculed it. Perhaps they finally granted it more as a sort of medal for war services at the home base than because they were really convinced of woman's equality. Besides, countless men had come to discount the franchise as more a burden than a privilege and were no longer jealous of masculine rights and prerogatives! Tired of voting anyway, they were willing to let the women do it. "It's no use voting," said a well-paid mechanic in 1923. "I haven't voted for eight years, and now the women are voting, I sha'n't never bother to vote again!"

Yet even the illiterate laborer can no longer taunt his wife that she cannot vote and is therefore his inferior. Her political equality has corrected the false perspective. Though too often she

neglects to cast her ballot, it gives her new self-respect to know that she can vote when she wishes to, and is a full citizen at last. It has dignified womanhood and also girlhood. The boastful boy can no longer crow over his sister, for her vote will some day match his, and probably be fully as intelligent. Though unrevised statutes like those of Ohio still declare that the man is the head of the household, we all know them to be essentially dead letters. The new dignity woman has gained through political equality has inevitably given her higher standing in her home, and more assurance in claiming it. Her new political status has made a fundamental domestic change. She's a part of the government; there's no gainsaying it!

THE MIRACLE OF FEMININE EDUCATION

The better education of women, as well as their political advancement, has also increased the respect of their husbands, sons and fathers. This is purely automatic. With more girls than boys graduating from high schools and going on to college, women are rapidly becoming the better educated sex. In all coeducational schools and uni-

versities, and these are now vastly in the majority, the girls make it very difficult for the boys to keep pace with them. The Phi Beta Kappa honor society is becoming so feminized, many college boys pretend to scorn it—though no man was yet known to refuse a key! The claim that women are mentally inferior can never again be made by an intelligent man. Feminine patience and carefulness in details help women to learn the mastery of technic in the industrial arts and crafts, thus making them with embarrassing frequency the successful rivals of men in seeking skilled employment. Even in politics, long a matter of least concern to women, they are making astonishing gains in intelligent mastery, through the activities of the League of Women Voters and innumerable women's clubs. Few women as yet have broken into the ranks of office-holders, but it is the fault of their own sex. Too many women "would rather be bossed by men." The female foreman has seldom been popular.

Meanwhile, woman's better education has broadened her interests, pleasures, usefulness and community activities, thus greatly enriching her life. It has developed her taste and her judgment in a great variety of new fields of human endeavor. All

this tends to scatter women's interests and make their lives far less home-centered, which millions of them needed, to get them out of the domestic rut and make them more intelligent comrades for their husbands. But it is exceedingly fortunate for the home, at this critical juncture, that household economics and domestic science have developed apace. This has helped the home to retain the loyalty and respect of intelligent women as an arena for adequate mental activity. Home-making at its best has been elevated to the level of a learned profession! It is now a fine art, based broadly on a manifold science, with remarkable efficiency possible in skillful management and mastery of its fascinating technical details. There is no greater difference between peasant farming, with one horse and a red cow, and a highly specialized, modern, scientific agriculture, than there is between slovenly housekeeping and the efficient work of the trained home-maker in an electrified home, who is an artist not only in interior decoration and tasteful furnishing, but in preparing balanced meals, maintaining the family health, making or selecting attractive and appropriate clothing and meeting all social and neighborly requirements besides saving for the future—and doing it all well within the family in-

come, on a scientific budget. Smartness alone will not do all this. It takes intelligence plus education.

WOMAN'S ASTONISHING INROADS INTO INDUSTRY

There can be no question that the improved political and educational status of American women has raised the level of family life. It is not so easy to answer the question, What has been the effect upon the home of woman's new *economic* status? There have been both gains and losses for the family. As to woman herself, her new economic independence and versatility have brought her few losses but tremendous gains. Let it be remembered, however, that whenever the family suffers, the woman suffers most; and that if her personal economic gain comes at the expense of the home, it is costing her more than it is worth.

After knocking at many doors in vain for generations, women have at last secured admission to them all. All doors to labor that she really wishes to enter are now open to her. Not one is closed today on account of her sex, unless it be in the transportation ranks, where labor is most highly organized. There are even women blacksmiths; and one woman is a veterinary surgeon! Naturally in the heavier trades

she has few representatives. There are no women fire-fighters, no women boiler-makers, structural iron-workers, ladlers or puddlers; no women millwrights, wheelwrights, roofers or slaters, soldiers, sailors or marines. No woman is a locomotive engineer, railway mail clerk, conductor or trainman (except on street railways) or mining engineer. But they are in practically everything else.[1]

Traditional taboos still hamper the women wage-earners, but 8,549,511 of them are now in competition with men, in about all professions and skilled crafts. There is considerable discrimination against the woman in wages, but even this helps her secure the job and hold it against men, if she does the work well; while her superior quickness, deftness and manual dexterity enable her to outstrip her male rivals in many occupations. This new situation has developed in some quarters a real sex antagonism which has its amusing aspects. Many labor unions are unfriendly to her, though, fortunately, the issue is gradually settling itself in a rational way, as women are tending to monopolize those skilled trades in which they become naturally more

[1] The data in this and the four following paragraphs have been worked out by the author from the Census Bureau's report on "Occupations," in *The Fourteenth Census of the United States, vol. iv.*

proficient than men. Doubtless men's wages in any trade are at first depressed when women enter it in competition with them. It is the inevitable effect of the natural law of supply and demand. But no man has any right to plead this as a reason for forbidding any capable woman the chance to earn her living. Quite likely she has as many dependent on her labor as he has. In any case, all that will fairly settle such a competition is the test of efficiency. If the woman does the work better than the man, she gets the job, usually, and has a right to it. The inferior man cannot hold it long against her. He must seek work which he can do better than she.

There are fields which few women will ever care to enter, though the last census reported one female butler, three women plumbers, two women forest-rangers, six women scavengers, three baggage-women, one woman road-repair foreman, one woman coppersmith, three women auctioneers, two women life-savers, one woman haybaler and thirty-three women bootblacks. In 1900 there was one woman blacksmith. Then in 1910 there were thirty-one reported, scattered in fifteen states; but male competition proved too keen, for in 1920 only five remained! In 1920 there were women sheriffs

in fifty-six counties (against three in 1910), and 236 policewomen, besides 1,173 probation officers and detectives.

Ten per cent of people reporting as farmers are women, 15 per cent of those in trade, including 41 per cent of the store clerks; 15 per cent of those in manufacturing and mechanical industries, including 35 per cent of the shoemakers, 65 per cent of the clothing workers, and 58 per cent of the cigar and cigarette makers. Only one-fourth of one per cent of miners are women, and one-third of one per cent of the chauffeurs, and but one-seventh of one per cent of the wood-choppers; but 94 per cent of the telephone operators are women, and 46 per cent of all persons in clerical occupations, including 49 per cent of all bookkeepers and 92 per cent of all stenographers.

Of all listed in the ranks of the professions, 47 per cent are women, including 56 per cent of the musicians and music teachers, 84 per cent of all other teachers, nearly 97 per cent of trained nurses, 41 per cent of all artists, 90 per cent of all librarians, two-thirds of all social workers, 45 per cent of the authors, 17 per cent of editors and reporters, 21 per cent of photographers, nearly 30 per cent of the actors, 37 per cent of designers and 35 per cent

United States postmasters. There are 137 women architects, 1,787 women ordained as clergymen (1.5 per cent), 1,738 women admitted to the bar as lawyers (also 1.5 per cent), 7,219 women physicians and surgeons (5 per cent), 1,829 dentists (3 per cent), 1,663 osteopaths, 11,350 doctors' assistants and 7,902 "other healers," making almost 30,000 women in medical and surgical professions, or over one-eighth of the total. There are 639,241 women school-teachers in America, besides 10,075 who are college professors, an increase in ten years of 161,214 teachers and 7,117 professors.

THE MOST RADICAL CHANGE IN HISTORY

To all of us older than forty, the above list looks like a miracle, though it will be a mere commonplace in the future. So significant is it, Groves states: "Eventually, when the evolution of the family has progressed further than at present, it will be clear to students of social institutions that no more radical change in the entire history of the human family has ever happened than that through which we are now passing, based fundamentally on woman's economic independence. The family in all its aspects, and other social institutions in so

far as they came in contact with the family, have become firmly adjusted to woman as a dependent of man. Costly as was the Industrial Revolution in the hardship it imposed upon woman, the price paid was not too great for her emergence into independence." [1]

To put it briefly, this new economic status *has set woman free.* Whether or not she has become a "wage slave," as the socialist soap-box orator so glibly avers, she need no longer be a domestic slave, a victim of the lust or cruelty of any man. She can now shift for herself. It is well for every man to know that his wife is not dependent upon him for a living. There is an independent place for her in the business world. This, of course, has given occasion for many divorces, though it has really caused few, for there were other and deeper causes. Doubtless it has increased the number of divorces, and some perhaps were not justified, so the home has suffered. Doubtless, also, the increased opportunity for women in business has delayed marriage and has made certain women unwilling to marry at all. Quite possibly such women were lacking in the domestic temperament and would not have been

[1] Groves, Ernest R., *Social Problems of the Family,* p. 74. J. B. Lippincott Company.

successful home-builders, so the home was not the loser.

THE EFFECT UPON BIRTH-RATE AND DEATH-RATE

It is evident, of course, that considerable home neglect is chargeable to careless mothers whose wage-earning has interfered with their responsibilities at home. In the past much of this has been inevitable in poor homes, and such mothers deserve sympathy rather than criticism. But now that hundreds of thousands of middle-class women continue their own work after marriage,[1] not always because they need the income, but for the sake of a career, it has become a question for serious consideration whether such a policy is fair to the home. The primary problem involved is the effect upon the birth-rate. For instance, in many communities still there is discrimination against married school-teachers. There seems to be a conviction that to encourage teachers to teach after marriage is rather certain to depress the birth-rate. Statistical experience on this topic is still rather limited in this coun-

[1] From 1890 to 1920, the number of women wage-earners in the United States increased 124.8 per cent. But meanwhile the number of *married* women wage-earners increased 272.7 per cent. See Dublin, L. I., *op. cit.*, p. 237.

try, but English census reports contain a special section on this subject which makes clear that the birth-rate in homes of women wage-earners is unusually low.

This, however, is more apt to prove true of the professional and clerical classes than of factory workers. For instance, married women in English and Welsh cotton mills show a birth-rate of 82 per cent of the normal current rate; while the rate for those in lace and canvas factories is almost normal (98 per cent and 96 per cent). Silk workers are somewhat less prolific, their rate being only 77 per cent of the normal, and the rate for married barmaids is still lower, 63 per cent. In other groups, however, it is evident that wage-earning outside the home reduces the number of children nearly half, the percentage for teachers being only 52 per cent, for clerks 55 per cent, for musicians 54 per cent and for actresses 43 per cent of the average birth-rate. It is undoubtedly true, judging from experience in England as cited above, that most of the two million married women in American industry are reducing the size of their families because of their wage-earning, and in very many cases eliminating children altogether, especially among the professional groups.

However, the reduction in birth-rate is not serious when the reduction in death-rate keeps pace with it. Rising civilization brings reduction in both the birth-rate and the death-rate, and when the latter keeps pace with the former, the *survival-rate*, which determines natural population, is not materially changed. For example, "The birth-rate of Hungary decreased from 44.6 per thousand in 1881-86 to 37 per thousand in 1909; that of Prussia, from 37.4 to 31.8; Italy, 38 to 32.4; England, 33.5 to 25.8; Scotland, 33.3 to 26.4; France, 24.7 to 19.6; an average decrease of 6.4 in the annual birth-rates per thousand of population; or of about 18 per cent, figured on the 1881-86 birth-rates. But because death-rates also were falling steadily, the rate of natural increase actually rose during these years in Hungary, Prussia and Italy. In Scotland, England and France the rate of increase of population declined only 8 per cent, although the birth-rate fell."[1] As a factor in the problem of working-women, the rising death-rate of children is far more serious than the falling birth-rate.

Many conflicting factors enter into a study of the death-rate; but it is evident that there is a high likelihood of death among children of most classes

[1] Dublin, L. I., *op. cit.*, p. 92.

of workingwomen. Neighbors are naturally inclined to attribute this to the mother's neglect, due to her wage-earning. A study of this problem in Scotland in 1914 shows a 62-per-cent excess mortality of infants of working mothers, in a comparison of over 10,000 cases, half of whom were wage-earners.[1]

In a study of infant mortality in the United States by the national Childrens' Bureau, very similar results were obtained.[2] In every city but one investigated it was clearly shown that infants born of mothers who had worked for wages the previous year were less likely to live. In Akron, the mortality rate of infants whose mothers were not gainfully employed was only 77.2, but the rate in cases where the mother worked for wages was as high as 107.4 per thousand births, an excess mortality of 39 per cent in the workingmothers' homes. Even worse in Fall River, where industrial conditions on lower levels prevail in the textile mills, the death-rate of infants per thousand births was 160.5 for housewives, but nearly double that (303.6) for wage-earning mothers. It is all too evident that the

[1] Dunlop, J. C., *The Fertility of Marriage in Scotland.*

[2] Children's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor, *Bulletins* 9, 20, 29, 37, 52, 68, 72 and 119.

gainful employment of mothers outside their homes is a serious menace to the health and the life of their children.

It is the opinion of the South End Public School Association in Chicago, with its large membership, that much of the delinquency of the children in that city is due to the neglect of working mothers and their lack of supervision of children out of school hours. In a vigorous set of resolutions last January they especially urged the wage-earning mothers to remain at home unless obliged to work to support dependents. There can be no doubt that there is a considerable amount of such neglect and that large numbers of children are thrown upon their own resources and become a menace to the neighborhood and to each other. Where the mother is absolutely obliged to work, the city must meet the problem with the nursery school and the kindergarten for the younger children, and the longer school day for the rest. We may well have more patience with the working women whose neglect of their children is more or less inevitable than with the equally neglectful women whose excessive social life lets them see as little of their children as if they worked in shops or factories.

It is very suggestive in this connection that Smith

College is definitely facing this economic problem with something radically new in education. They have recently opened an "Institute for the coördination of Women's Interests," with the financial assistance of the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Fund. This Institute is conducting researches to test out experimentally various means of keeping a job and a husband at the same time and maybe mothering a child—trying to harmonize marriage and motherhood with a career.

THE FAMILY TYPE IS BEING MODIFIED

It is when we consider the large proportion of modern women who insist upon having a career as well as a husband, that we discover that the standard type of family is being decidedly modified. The continuance of gainful employment of women after marriage has become so general we cannot overlook the fact that this custom is rather definitely changing the American family. Exceedingly common among lower wage-earners, it is rapidly spreading even among college graduates. Typical instances are the following.

Couple S married with the intention of the wife's continuing as a teacher while the husband, after

winning his Harvard Master's in Business Administration, earned a good salary as a traffic specialist. Couple R, graduates of an Eastern university and a Middle-West college, secured good openings for both in New York, he in a trust company and she in the city library. Both were successful and have had repeated increases in salary. As in the case of Couple S, they breakfast together daily, but seldom meet again before their late dinner. Their home life is limited to Sundays and the evenings that they do not spend in the theater and elsewhere. Couple T are both Masters of Arts. The husband is a college teacher and his gifted young wife holds a secretaryship, doing constructive editorial work which she enjoys. To be sure, no children have yet come to any of these couples, after an average of ten years married. Perhaps this was due to the economic status; possibly not.

Clearly they have modified the family type. The question is, Is there any good argument against it? Had these educated young wives no right to a career? Perhaps the term "career" is more appropriate in the case of the woman musician, artist or actor than in the less spectacular cases cited; but they are all using the term and the principle is the same, involving *the post-marital economic and*

social independence of women. Should they "have their cake and eat it too?" In many cases the problem is created because they fear their cake will only be bread; and modern young folks do not pray for daily bread. Their happiness requires a highly seasoned menu, socially speaking, and everything on an expensive scale. Their parents' luxuries have become their necessities. It takes two pocketbooks to pay the bill.

Besides, the apartment is so tiny and convenient, and the reduced housework such a bagatelle that many a young wife, who has dutifully given up her career because her old-fashioned husband rather wished it, finds the days too long and too lonely, and the neighbors all persistent strangers. So after exhausting the resources of the park and the window-shopping and the matinées, the longing for comradeship at the old task becomes so strong, back she goes to the office job when a vacancy unexpectedly occurs. She comforts herself with the idea that "anyway, she's not a parasite," though her husband spurns the allusion and regrets her ambitions. The result is not the kind of home he wanted and is quite willing to pay for. Regretfully he recognizes that his home has become some-

thing quite different from his father's. Just what has made this change in the family type?

It has been an inevitable evolution. Once you grant woman an equal status with man, politically, educationally, economically, socially, you have made inevitable a change in the family as an institution. Woman is now a full-fledged person, with all the rights of personality, including the right of complete self-expression through the exercise of her best talents in whatever career they may indicate. If other things are equal, why should marriage hamper a woman's career any more than her husband's? It should not, if—; but that IF makes it a difficult question to answer fairly. At least he is no longer the sole head of the family, now that they are equals before the law.

Forty years ago a certain New England boot-maker left his work-bench for the wash-bench and kitchen because his wife was a better milliner than he was a boot-maker! It was better for the family purse to let his wife have the career, so he took the kitchen. With the rapid increase in the education of women, and their many vocational opportunities, it is no longer unusual for the wife to be more skillful than her husband and earn the larger salary. What shall such a woman do? Shall she give up her

salary and try to make a home on her husband's smaller income? Or shall she wait for a man who is economically her superior and perhaps never marry? Or shall she marry and continue the work for which she was trained and in which she has proved her success? It is an embarrassing choice between three alternatives, none of which is ideal. All because she is too smart for the men! One queer result of the recent progress of women is, many men have not kept pace, and the women have overtaken them. We have long had families where the wife was the shrewder *spender*. In fact, women now do most of the family purchasing, for it pays. And now come the families in which the wife is the better *earner*, because she has more or better-trained talents. *Shall we expect such a woman to bury her talents or use them?*

WHEN A MARRIED WOMAN'S CAREER IS JUSTIFIED

Is it not clear that a woman of outstanding ability should have a right to her career and also a right to her marriage? The race needs her children, and would suffer loss should she not marry. Society also needs her skillful, expert service, and would suffer loss should she quit her career. Under such circum-

stances, a wise husband adjusts himself to conditions, and his willingness to do so will be the measure of his love for her. Likewise, her love for him and for her home will be tested by her willingness to safeguard her family interests at every possible point. At least her career should never handicap her children.

On the contrary, when the wife's career is a very nominal one, and her earnings simply provide greater luxuries, the case is somewhat different. It may be she is paying too high a price for her little independence; certainly so if she is cheating her home of the joy of children and robbing herself of full personality in motherhood. Or if there are children, and the wife's wage-earning for the sake of luxuries results in her neglecting them, her case is parallel to that of the mother whose coveted career is purely social. We all know too many superficial women who use the new freedom selfishly in excessive social life, trying to outshine their rivals in an endless round of clubs and parties, while their neglected homes are turned over to incompetent maids and substitute mothers. The neglect of children is the unpardonable sin of motherhood. Nothing can justify it; certainly not

the society craze or the "career" which is simply pin-money wage-earning for more luxuries.

THE SUPREME CAREER, HOME-MAKING

For the earnest woman with high ideals both for her individual life and for her home it is possible to sublimate the perfectly natural instinct for a career by finding that career in distinguished home-making. With all the splendid efficiencies now possible, and all the scientific and technical assistance now available, home-making, including but transcending household economics, can be lifted by a thoroughly capable woman to the status of a real career. It will not be denied that many such women, of superior talents and queenly personalities, are finding in their splendid homes everything that characterizes a true career, scope for the fullest self-expression, the use and development of their finest talents, appreciation of their ability and gratitude for their noble servive, as well as the growth in character which crowns every high career. Mere money has little to do with it. The queen mothers are found equally among the poor and the rich. At both extremes they have a difficult career. But the humblest mother who has made a genuine success

of her family would never exchange careers with the lonely woman with the hungry heart who airily in her early twenties gave up home life for the baubles of a stage career, a business career or even a college career, and now, as the plaudits grow fainter, *goes down toward the sunset alone.*

How does the new status of women affect the family? In general it spells progress and makes for a happier, finer home. Anything that means greater freedom and wider opportunity for all daughters, sisters, wives and mothers cannot seriously upset the family. This is the transition generation, however, when the new status reached its climax, and the adjustment is not an easy one. Just now the family is in somewhat unstable equilibrium as a result. A richer home life of greater efficiency is certain to develop, with a better educated, more ambitious, more capable womanhood; but meanwhile great spiritual values are put in jeopardy by the new independence and the frank experimenting, while the type of the family itself is being somewhat modified. A fair-minded man must admit that the day of woman's opportunity is long overdue and must be welcomed. She deserves all she has won—all the full rights of personality, the legal rights of a complete citizen, equal rights in every

field of education and training, every opportunity to earn her living that her powers and talents can meet, open doors into every skilled trade, calling and profession, freedom to marry or not to marry without loss of dignity and a chance for a career if she has the genius for it.

But it is evident that the freedom of this new status is being abused. It certainly lowers the birth-rate. It cheats some homes and husbands of their children. It results in some home neglect, with resulting delinquency of children and a decidedly higher death-rate. It tends to increase divorces and separations; for most women could now earn their own living and many are willing to risk it. It has increased the restlessness of married women and their desire for needless luxuries. It has encouraged much unnecessary wage-earning by young wives and mothers.

Hence it has evolved a new type of family, with two heads instead of one, two bread-winners and providers, and no homekeeper. It has dethroned the husband and changed the family monarchy into a two-party commission! It makes possible a more complete comradeship, but at once endangers it by the diversity of independent interests and separate activities which threaten the family unity.

This ultra-modern type of family leads easily to companionate marriage, whenever the desire for a career or the lure of self-indulgence deliberately excludes children. The result is merely a social partnership in supreme selfishness. Thus the new status of woman has created new, complex and difficult problems which must be solved, but the finer type of woman which is being evolved by this marvelous expansion of her life opportunity will be able, with her husband's help, to solve these problems. The difficult elements will be harmonized with home interests, for, after all, the home is organically and ultimately woman's supreme interest. She has most at stake in the family, has always been its chief defender and will not fail it now.

Chapter VIII

New Complications Through Changing Social Standards

"Alas! the times are not what they were" is the opening sentence on one of the oldest cuneiform tablets found in the excavations of ancient Babylon. This complaint, so modern in its accent, is about 5,000 years old! Let us avoid similar pessimism by recognizing the great social and moral gains of the present generation. We are living in a better world than our grandfathers knew. Never doubt it. He who denies it simply confesses his ignorance of history. Never was the social consciousness so strong, nor the social conscience so sensitive. There is a far better organized social movement, better recognition of public responsibility both for the relief of poverty and for elimination of its causes. There is a social conscience in business now, with more sincere application of the Golden Rule than ever before in his-

tory. Not only more fair play in industry, but more honesty in trade and in advertising, and an international conscience arising strongly against war. There is manifestly a better world in the making, and it is no time for pessimism.

FRESH COMPLICATIONS DUE TO SPEED

But the speeding up of life has complicated social and even moral standards. This eager generation is living by the speedometer rather than the compass, and it is not so true an indicator of real progress. Direction really counts for more than speed, in spite of the urge of the age. With 25,000,000 motor cars now in this country alone, distance is being annihilated, speed is becoming more than ever a national obsession, and the go-fever, especially at week-ends, is our most prevalent disease. The automobile has greatly broadened and enriched the family life of America. This should go without saying. To be sure, it has become a great source of expense, for countless families quite unwarranted; but it has proved an economic asset probably for more, and for all a blessing to health and saner mental outlook. It has broken up isolation

and has widened horizons for millions of home-bound women.

The automobile has made life less home-centered, or at least has given the family a far longer social radius. If the traditional buggy had a twenty-five mile cruising radius, the motor has a radius of one hundred to a thousand, depending on the youth's age and audacity. And with the imminence of the air-flivver, soon to be turned out in Detroit at quantity production and as cheap as any other Ford, the worrying mother of the future will have her hands full. The point is, cheap mobile power and speed have given wings to our young folks, and the day of the anchoring apron-string is forever past. There is no denying that this has vastly complicated our home problem. Simultaneously, the chaperone system has broken down completely. Even the suggestion is likely to raise a laugh. It is taken as the rarest joke.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE NEW FREEDOM

Possibly the older women did not anticipate it, but the emancipation of wives and mothers brought new freedom to the daughters also. This has greatly

altered the accepted code of young people's relations, and a new type of comradeship has developed, both in college and out, between the sexes in later teens. This comradeship has some very attractive, sensible and wholesome phases and probably works out well in the majority of cases. It has made our modern youth more natural than their parents used to be. But its danger lies in the fact that it assumes the freedom of maturity without the adult's experience and judgment, self-control and social restraints. Hence the tragic experiences, all too frequent, resulting from a new liberty which was not justified.

With the consummation of the new status of woman, there have been fewer sex distinctions and social differences. Ever since the war, girls have increasingly affected the mannish in dress, hair, language and manners. It is as easy for the daring girl to swear today as it was for her grandmother to whistle; and in some circles, relatively it is less of a misdemeanor. The same type of woman and girl have claimed the right to smoke, drink cocktails, pet, dance daringly, and otherwise *defy conventions, largely to prove their new liberty and to assert that it is their privilege to do everything their brothers can*, for it is no longer a man's world. A

keen-witted gentleman said recently to the writer, "No I don't smoke cigarettes; but if I did, I believe I would give it up, it has become such an effeminate habit!"

A few women smoke because they like it; many even though they do not like it; and others because they think the men like it; but it seems to be chiefly a pose, a daring gesture asserting a modern woman's right to do what she pleases. The most dangerous aspect of it for girls is that it *is* daring, and therefore carries with it a breakdown of restraints. It is a silent challenge to the young man opposite, as if to say, "I'm just as devilish as you are, and just as speedy!" At best, it is distinctly unfeminine, distinctly coarsening and tending to make a woman masculine, lacking in womanly fineness and daintiness. There will be a reaction against the custom, as there has already come a reaction against the mannish bob and the mannish garb. A woman cannot be queenly and disown her sex. To abuse her freedom and share in the masculine vices and liberties will get her nowhere. It makes her less of a woman but no more of a man.

Possibly the speeding up of life has been partly responsible for the prevalent sex complex that is evident in many ways, especially in the realism in

literature, on the stage and in the movies. The extreme frankness in sex-problem novels and the low moral standards in the snappy-story magazines, so widely read by youth, have unquestionably exerted a vicious influence. This general sex complex has been accentuated by ultra-modern styles in dress and other aspects of female self-assertion of new liberties. Anti-social sex ideals have to some extent developed, expressed by a certain woman radical thus: "My body's my own. I'll do what I please with it." The chief newness involved in some of these symptoms is the frankness and boldness with which they are revealed.

NERVOUS TENSION AND MORAL OVERSTRAIN

It is very evident that there is a nervous tension in our speedy modern living that too often brings overstrain. It is too much for our restless, impatient people with limited self-control. Hence the moral overstrain so frequently in evidence. It is not due to inherent viciousness, but rather is a symptom of the age and a product of the social conditions of current urban life. The very increase in the mechanical conveniences and other mechanisms of living have tended to make life more com-

plicated. Everything is too highly spiced and jazzed.

How typical it is for a bunch of young folks to breeze into one of their homes and immediately switch on the radio! The quiet in the place seems to oppress them. It doesn't matter much what they tune in with, preferably jazz, but anything noisy will do. Then they keep on talking, usually in spasmodic, staccato interruptions or all at once, never listening to the radio, but using it as a jazzy background to pep up their good-time to a noisier pitch of hilarity! Then a sudden impulse sends them flying off ten miles away, six in a flivver! Even young nerves cannot long stand the overstrain of perpetual speeding and dizzy living. It unfits them for the plain, wholesome, peaceful living which seems to them an utter bore. Too much ginger dulls the appetite for bread. The jazz habit breeds inevitable restlessness and makes a quiet home seem like a prison.

Luxury is a prevalent cause of lowered social standards, especially in suburban communities and cities. It is sometimes very demoralizing, resulting in utter selfishness. As Dr. S. Parkes Cadman says, "Too many grandchildren smoke and too many grandparents jazz. Mutton masquerades as

lamb and lamb as mutton." These are minor symptoms of a widespread home disease—*individualism run amuck*. In countless families every member is busy "expressing himself" with selfish abandon, obeying instinct and impulse without restraint, each running off on his own pet tangent, till the old home-centered life is no more. Selfishness is killing out the old home loyalty. The individualistic mother centers her interest in bridge winnings or social climbing. The individualistic father is absorbed in fighting his competitors and "the plaguey unions." No wonder the individualistic sons and daughters pursue their own favorite sense pleasures, crushes, crazes and intoxications, quite independently, each going his or her own separate way, and making the home chiefly a point of departure and reluctant return.

INSIDIOUS THRILL-CHASING

Such centrifugal families are seldom found in the country. They are usually urban or suburban, signs of over-prosperity, social satiety, demoralizing luxury, and the sudden growth of commercialized sensational amusements. Rural life in general plods along in the same good safe grooves;

but city life finds a new thrill every week for every member of the family. Thrill-chasing absorbs the time and energy of the city multitudes who lose their ideals in the easy glamour of the city lights. In fact, the thrill is the chief pull to the city, for the rural youth whom it entices are more fun hungry than dollar hungry. Farm life is necessarily a partnership—the original, primeval, economic partnership. The farm family simply has to function, or the business fails. But the city family, especially in flats, tenements or apartments, easily becomes centrifugal. There is less mutual dependence and infinitely more temptation for each to go his own selfish way.

Country life is still home-centered. City life must again become so, if the American family is to be saved. It is rather rapidly becoming a very different sort of social institution. This selfish, thrill-chasing group in the centrifugal home, related by blood but no longer by mutual interests or real life-sharing, is no longer a true family. Often they are tied together only by the paternal purse strings; certainly not by the maternal apron strings, or anybody's heart strings. This type of family presents a difficult challenge to religion. The church in the city and the suburb must find a way to rebuild the

temple of home religion, for nothing else can stop the spread of this insidious disease. Education alone cannot do it, not even social education, for it lacks the motive power to work the miracle. Only a new-born spiritual purpose, in terms of modern religion fitted anew to modern social life, can furnish the motivation powerful enough to conquer this "individualism run amuck," the insidious disease of the ultra-modern.

THE LURE OF COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE

How radically the social standards of the family have changed was apparent in connection with the recent popular discussion of companionate marriage. It was quite evident from public debates, and discussions in the press, that the present generation regards as debatable questions the impermanence of marriage, the freedom of divorce by mutual consent, trial marriage, birth control, and the "companionate" contract which combines all these new heresies. To call them *new*, however, is to do violence to the precocious ingenuity of ancient Rome at its worst; but most of the world had forgotten them since. To be sure, there has been for two generations a strong drift into companionate

marriage. It is only a euphemism for trial marriage plus race suicide—two harsh terms which carry their own condemnation. Combine these two and you get a strange social partnership. It accepts the home but denies the family. It seizes all privileges but denies responsibilities. The companionate is only an imitation family, or, as some sociologists call it, an *arrested family*—by mutual contract excluding children.

Companionate marriage is not really marriage with a divorce coupon attached, for no one can legally issue such a coupon in advance. The parties contracting such a union can merely agree mutually to separate at the other's request when the relationship palls. Nor is it insurance against having children; no physician can issue such insurance. No sure means of birth control by contraception have yet been discovered. All that the contract means, then, is, We will agree to be as selfish as the laws of nature and the state will let us, and will enjoy ourselves on a trial basis. Is such a partnership marriage? It is just *a we-two society for superlative selfishness!*

It is rather significant that the chief protagonist for this type of marriage is a man whose work as juvenile court judge has kept him in contact with

the seamy side of life. The hundreds of broken homes which he has known too well have obscured his vision of the vast majority of American homes with which he seems to have limited acquaintance, where love and mutual respect and decency prevail. Of course his arguments are weighty, but they are all pathological and abnormal, like his personal experience. Granted that serious sex temptations are prevalent and that the new freedom in the lives of our young people has increased them, to say that the only solution is early marriage on the companionate basis is to deny the fine idealism of most of our youth. It is safe to say that most of the support for this marital novelty has come from the middle-aged, including some sociologists. College students are discussing it with avidity, but not with general acceptance or conviction.

While discussion was rife over a conspicuous case of a college boy's marrying a girl of eighteen, on the companionate basis, while her wealthy parents supported her and he continued his studies, many students of the three universities in Pittsburgh were interviewed for their views on the subject. Not a single student was found who approved of it! One young man said, "I wouldn't go into a marriage feeling that it could be broken so easily. I

wouldn't feel I was married." Another student said: "Apple sauce! They just want to live together. That marriage will never work. If they loved each other they'd feel differently." "I wouldn't marry a girl and let her family support her," remarked a self-respecting youth. "Most of the coeds," says Dr. J. H. Snowden, editor of the *Presbyterian Banner*, "laughed it off as nonsense, bad taste and a lot of rot. They said that if they married a man they would at least want to feel that everything was going to be all right. Several admitted it was all right to marry while in school, if they could live together and manage to support themselves; but as for being supported by their families—nothing doing." These characteristic college phrases ring true. They show the good sense and ideals of unspoiled youth.

However, it must be admitted that a few college students of earnest purpose have been led recently to think seriously of companionate marriage as a solution for the modern sex and family problems. Their pessimism is due to their strong feeling that their own parents have made a sad failure of marriage and that modern social conditions make a home with children quite out of the question for

them. Wholesome young folks could not have come to such a desolate conclusion of their own accord.

The *Public Ledger* recently published some pungent paragraphs under the heading, "No Chance for Happiness in Companionate Marriage." It asserted that this scheme is "just a handful of dust thrown in the eyes of Mrs. Grundy in the hope that it will blind her, so that she will not see what a young couple are doing and turn her back on them because of it. For the life of me I cannot see where it solves any problem or would add anything to the happiness of humanity. . . . In reality the companionate marriage does not offer so much chance of happiness as does the common or garden variety of marriage, because it is built upon a rotten foundation. It rests upon the desire of the flesh, the mood of the moment, upon fancies as light as air, upon whims and caprices and temperament and temper, all of which are as variable as the wind. It will be a sad day when the clerk in the marriage bureau asks a young couple, 'What sort of marriage license do you want, long-term or a ninety-day option?' " [1]

The widespread discussion of these issues has

[1] Dix, D., in *The Philadelphia Public Ledger*, copyrighted. Quoted by permission of the publishers.

left the popular impression that the permanence of marriage is quite a debatable question. There is no denying that the current generation is taking the whole subject more lightly, whether or not they actually have less respect for the institution of marriage than their parents have. Among persons of poor taste and abnormal sense of humor there has always been coarse horseplay at weddings. This did not indicate any lessened belief in the permanence of marriage. But there has recently developed in the rising generation, with its strange reaction against any sort of sentiment, a real flippancy regarding the whole subject of marriage and a minimizing of its gravity. Perhaps the trend toward simpler weddings is a good thing, though we cannot recommend giving up the service altogether and using the city clerk's bare formula instead. The shortest road is not always the best way home. Nor can we commend this frivolous attempt to be funny which a pair of youngsters sent last year to their friends in lieu of a wedding announcement:

REQUIESCAT IN PACE
THE HAPPILY DEPARTED
SINGLE LIVES OF
.....JR.
AND

.....HIS WIFE
AT HOME—FREQUENTLY
AT 3257 ..... STREET
KEW GARDENS, LONG ISLAND

A PERVERSION OF TRUE MARRIAGE

The objectionable element in the companionate arrangement is not the postponement of children. This is a matter of reasonable prudence in any civilized family. But there are several other factors involved in it, so radically subversive of Christian ideals that it cannot safely be accepted by Christian people. These items include the elimination of children altogether as the goal of the family, and the idea that marriage is just a simple contract between "the two parties concerned," therefore making trial marriage allowable as a simple matter of personal rights.

The chief heresy involved is the latter. It attacks the very sacredness of personality itself, and it ignores the right of society to protect the social welfare at this critical point. Marriage is not a simple contract like buying an automobile or forming a partnership to manufacture dolls. There is no contract which can be compared with the contract to marry. It is absolutely unique. It is the

most sacred agreement any individual can possibly enter into, because it involves sharing with God in the work of creation. To cheapen such a relationship is to degrade human nature.

Of course the two parties most intimately concerned are not the only persons involved. Society has something at stake in every marriage. The children who may result from this union, even when most persistently unwelcome, have everything at stake in it, and society must protect them from the selfishness of their own parents. Hence the necessity for marriage laws. Such vitally important issues cannot be safely left to individual caprice. Granted that when women won full rights of personality, industrially and politically, this logically forced a change in the family as an institution. But women should be the last to favor such a degrading step as trial marriage, for they would suffer most from it. The saddest argument against the companionate is *the discarded wife*, who fails to pass the final examination, and is left alone, despoiled of her youthful charm and wifely dignity, because her fickle spouse has lost sexual interest in her and goes gaily on to another "companion" who appeals more subtly to his unbridled instincts.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

Is it not evident that such a scheme is quite contrary to the trend of social evolution? By arduous struggle, through many generations, man has achieved a measure of self-control in monogamous marriage. This self-control is fundamental in the achievement of Christian character. Trial marriage is essentially reversion to type, a backward step toward concubinage and consecutive polygamy. As Fosdick says, "It is psychologically disruptive to the individual and socially ruinous to the nation." Though Lindsay tries to avoid the connection, companionate marriage is usually trial marriage. That is, most of its advocates regard it as an experimental arrangement, by mutual agreement, in the pleasure of the husband and the wife.[1] The tentative aspect of it greatly increases the likelihood of divorce. The very suggestion itself is unsettling and weakens the bond of union. It is based on a rotten foundation. Its central idea that marriage is to legalize sexual indulgence is an insult

[1] The term "Companionate" was invented in May, 1924, by Dr. M. M. Knight of Barnard College. Groves says, "A later conception (six months later, Kirkpatrick, Nov., 1924) of the companionate added the idea that the union was of temporary character, and that those who entered upon it should be allowed to choose for themselves divorce and remarriage, but only after some delay and conformably to regulations."—Groves, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family*, p. 89. J. B. Lippincott Company, publishers.

to humanity. It lowers humanity below the level of the nobler of the brute creation. There is no companionate marriage among lions or ostriches! They would be shocked by the suggestion.

It is better to refer to this form of union as "the companionate" as a number of sociologists do, rather than as companionate marriage. This is exactly the idea of Knight, who originated the term.[1] It is often styled "arrested marriage." It is a perversion of marriage. It is really a substitute for marriage, for it founds neither a home nor a family. In a small percentage of cases, such as ill-health, insanity, or otherwise tainted heredity, a couple should doubtless forego children. But for healthy people to marry with the mutual determination to try marriage but remain childless is of course anti-social, for if their selfishness became universal, it would end the race.

Selfishness is the most obvious motive in the companionate. It is the logical extreme of the selfish individualism which is running amuck in

[1] In his first article on the subject Knight said, "We may call the state of lawful wedlock entered into solely for companionship, and not contributing children to society, *the companionate;* using the term *family* in its true historical sense, as the institution for regulating reproduction, early education, property inheritance, and some other things."—Knight, M. M., *Journal of Social Hygiene,* May, 1924.

our self-indulgent day. The rise of Christian civilization has been a gradual conquest of human selfishness by altruism, in accord with the ideals of Jesus. Anything which encourages selfishness runs counter to this finest trend not only in human history but in the whole process of evolution. "Let us get clearly in our minds," suggests Fosdick, "that in revolting from obsolete fashions in the ancient family we must not revolt to trial marriage. Let us see distinctly that the monogamous relationship is the only psychologically complete, emotionally satisfactory, ethically serviceable, and socially productive form of marriage. Let us get this truth clearly in our minds and make it clear to our children. Then let this corollary be taught, that marriage is the most serious decision that men and women can face, and that, therefore, it is 'not to be entered into unadvisedly or lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God.' " [1]

WILLINGNESS TO DEFY CONVENTIONS

It is difficult to see anything in companionate marriage but the attempt to make respectable what

[1] Fosdick, H. E., "What is Happening to the American Family?" *The American Magazine,* October, 1928, p. 20.

has long been going on under the less lovely name of common-law marriage. The extent to which this kind of partnership has been recently increasing would greatly surprise most people. Zorbaugh's report of his investigations in 1926 in a large rooming-house section of Chicago revealed a discouragingly sordid situation. He made a house-to-house canvass of ninety contiguous blocks, not among slum-dwellers, but in the better rooming area. Nearly three-fourths of all the houses in the area rented one or more furnished rooms, and his careful census of the roomers included 20,007 names. One-tenth were single women, a little more than half were single men, and 38 per cent were living in couples, supposably married. He discovered that three-fifths of these couples were actually not married at all. That is, of the people living together, 3,042 were married and 4,562 were maintaining by mutual consent a sort of companionate arrangement.[1] These pathetic revelations show the intolerable loneliness in the city wilderness that forces such large numbers of young people thus to defy conventions. They also show to what an alarming extent the new social and

[1] See Zorbaugh, "The Dweller in Furnished Rooms, an Urban Type," in the *American Journal of Sociology*, July, 1926.

economic complications since the war have changed social standards and distinctly lowered ideals.

INCREASING TRAGEDY OF BROKEN HOMES

Anyone who addresses himself to this distressing problem of broken homes, from experience only in a happy marriage, must speak with more sympathy than personal knowledge. We must recognize, however, among the serious complications arising from our changing social standards, not only a rapid increase in the number of divorces, but doubtless, also, in the number of broken homes. The two are not identical, though often confused. Divorce is the result, not the cause of broken homes. The latter is the real problem, not the former. Divorce never really breaks up a home. It was a broken home before the suit for divorce was filed. The divorce was just the public recognition of the tragedy which already existed, but unfortunately it helps to make it permanent.

There are doubtless far more broken homes than divorces. But the study of divorce statistics gives us something of a line on the larger problem. An analysis of these statistics relieves our pessimism.

It is reassuring to know that the great mass of middle-class Christian Americans do not to any extent contribute to these divorce statistics. Popenoe states a well-known fact when he asserts that "both the delinquent rich and the delinquent poor appear in large ratio in the records of all forms of broken homes."[1] He cites Miss Mudgett's study of the Minneapolis divorce applicants, half of whom were clients of some charitable agency and most of whom had court records for some cause or another. It is notable that not only childless marriages, but mixed marriages, of people of different race, nationality or religion, are more apt to lead to divorce, and that property as well as children tends to hold families together. These are merely generalizations; all have numerous exceptions. The increased leniency toward divorce must be recognized as reasonable, provided a just cause exists. We should remember that Jesus' teaching on the subject related not to judicial divorce at all, but to personal divorce, in which the tyrant husband was the whole court with absolute authority. We cannot believe he would lack sympathy for the abused sufferer in any broken home; though his high ideal

[1] Popenoe, Paul, *The Conservation of the Family*, p. 81. Williams & Wilkins.

for the nobility and permanence of marriage is beyond question.

The same authority cited above says very incisively, "Is the institution of monogamy to be remodeled for the benefit of the delinquent rich and the delinquent poor, or is some other remedy more appropriate? . . . The selfish, fickle and feebly-inhibited will always give trouble in this respect. Marriage cannot be 'factory rebuilt' for such defectives. . . . Is it not stupid to talk of remaking the *mores* for the benefit of a small minority who are hopeless anyhow, really of defective mental constitution? If there is a remedy for this evil, it is in early training, mental hygiene and biological education, not in trial marriage or easy divorce. An analysis of love suggests the solution of many broken homes. Here again it is found that society is at work, in its usual way, to settle the problem at the wrong end—to wail over consequences instead of removing the causes. Any movement to prevent broken homes by such measures as trial marriage and divorce by mutual consent is a crime against the race, unless accompanied by a much more vigorous effort to remove the causes of broken homes." [1]

[1] Popenoe, Paul, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

The sooner the ordinary courts turn over the whole matter of divorce to special courts of domestic relations, the better for the American family. Among the causes of divorce we should have to rank shyster lawyers high in the list. They should be eliminated entirely from the picture. In fact, many high-minded lawyers have eliminated themselves and refuse divorce cases. It should never be necessary for any abused wife or husband to go to a lawyer for help in domestic troubles. The most effective work of family rehabilitation is done *with no lawyer in the courtroom*, but only the judge and the couple involved. Select the best available man or woman, with human sympathy and discernment, tactful patience, persuasiveness and common sense in addition to legal training, as judge of domestic relations, and half of the divorces will be prevented. This is already proved by experience. For more than ten years the judges handling such cases in Cleveland, by their tactful, sympathetic skill, have prevented more divorces than they have allowed. They have become a great force for social justice and moral protection and have certainly reduced the tragedy of broken homes. Social clinics rather than court procedure will be the future treatment of this social disease.

THE DRIFT FROM ETHICAL MOORINGS

Most insidious and far-reaching in its effect upon moral standards is the growing tendency of our generation to throw over all positive ethical authority. The idea that there is any fundamental basis for ideals, any absolute standard of right and wrong, is widely challenged. The naturalistic, mechanistic teaching of many colleges has been further disseminated by certain popular writers who have gained great vogue. The moral authority of the Scriptures, or in fact of any source of learning the divine will as to human duty, is seriously questioned. In fact, the whole concept of duty and oughtness, as based on a fixed ethic, is flatly denied. According to this popular school it is group opinion which makes anything right or wrong, rather than any absolute standard or ideal. Morality is to be settled by majorities! Ethics is subject to referendum and recall!

Granted that the *mores* of human society past and present have always settled questions of etiquette and social custom and have also stamped moral conduct with their approval or disapproval. Does this give every human group the divine right

to decide for themselves what is right and wrong on the great issues of morality? Were infanticide, the killing of the aged, polygamy or slavery ever right, whatever certain social groups have thought about them? Are there no eternal verities whose absolute rightness have been proved by the rise of a Christian civilization? Is there no immutable Moral Order—whether in the character of a righteous God or in essential social relationships —or does righteous behavior depend simply on combinations of circumstances and purely mechanistic reactions?

Just to state these conflicting ethical views, without debating them, is sufficient to remind the reader of the bewildering confusion in the minds of many of our young people today and the more daring of adults as well. Ethically it is a seething age. Personal responsibilities are not easily recognized, for the confusion of tongues is with us. Social standards and criteria for conscience are shifting and changing and fresh complications are thus created for the modern home. Never did the world need the ethical insight and spiritual help of the religion of Jesus and his ideals of social righteousness more than today.

Chapter IX

The Modern Child's Own Social Problems

Much has been said and written about the difficulties of the modern home. Much good paper has been spoiled by pessimism over the youth of today, in which parents most clearly reveal their feeling that they are the abused party. Meanwhile the children themselves have their own problems, chief of which, sometimes, is *getting along with their parents*. From the child's viewpoint, parents sometimes are exceedingly difficult. The present writer does not remember seeing any discussion of the home problem from this angle. Parents in their self-complacency seldom think of it. It has been suggested that the so-called boy problem should be called the parent problem; solve the latter and you settle the former. Yet many parents are unwilling to admit this.

Unquestionably, the new social strains in the modern family have taken their toll of childhood.

The worst phase of the situation in selfish, centrifugal families is the positive damage done the children. A spirit of resentment toward their parents, amounting sometimes to open hostility, is occasionally revealed to sympathetic, trusted teachers. In a recent frank discussion about parents in a class of fifteen-year-old girls there were some significant revelations. Only two of the group were inclined to make a slight defense of adults in general. "The rest," the teacher says, "attacked their parents with cheerful energy!" They loudly protested that their parents failed to understand them, could not get their viewpoint, had forgotten they were young themselves once, and did not appreciate the ability of older boys and girls to think for themselves, make decisions, and take care of their own affairs.

Quite evidently some parents are a problem to their children, as well as the reverse! In the midst of the discussion, one girl blazed forth with this bitter arraignment: "Parents are three things. They are *cowards*, because they are afraid to tell their children what they actually know and actually think themselves. They are *hypocrites*, because they try to pretend to their children that they are what they are not. And they are *dishonest*, because they try to make their children do things

that they won't do themselves, and be what they aren't themselves." Inquiry discovered the fact that this astonishing philippic echoed the words of an older sister; but the deep feeling shown proved it was no mere echo. There was open rebellion in that family and the youngest was one of the rebels.

Several others in the class, though not phrasing so sharply their antagonism toward their parents, showed real hostility, evident disrespect and even dislike for their fathers and mothers. In how many self-indulgent homes, where the elders sacrifice family unity and the welfare of children to the selfish pursuit of their own pleasure, are foolish, ultra-modern parents reaping this awful harvest of the wrath of abused and resentful youth? This is surely reaping the whirlwind.

A younger group of children in Sunday school were asked the question, "If you had the minister's chance to preach to your parents, what would you say to them?" Evidently their idea of preaching was saying "don't" and scolding people, though few of them had heard any preaching, except story sermons for children. It was surprising how many complaints they had against their parents. Two little girls were the only exceptions. One said, "I guess I'm satisfied," and the other said, "I'd tell

them that I love them." But the rest were eager for a chance to tell their parents how they needed to reform their conduct! There was a long catalogue of wrongs and injustices, mostly petty things which loomed surprisingly to little folks. Many wanted to protest against eating carrots; others abhorred onions or potatoes. Several lazy girls complained about compulsory housework; others objected to being forced to practice their music lessons. Many found fault because their freedom to play was interfered with, and in general resented their parents' compulsions, feeling them to be unfriendly forces to compel the child to do what was distasteful and not to do what was pleasant and desirable.

Usually their complaints were along purely physical or material lines, comparatively petty from the parents' standpoint. "In several instances," says the teacher making this report, "the child's protest, though voiced in terms of revolt against music lessons and carrots, really expressed a state of general hostility and resentment, actual rebellion, subdued by superior strength." The majority, however, seemed to feel that their parents intended to do the wise and right thing for their children, even though they wished they would

do many things differently. We have been inclined to suppose that most of the rebellious and critical attitude of children was after they entered the teens. It is rather surprising to find it beginning in earlier childhood.

ACUTE PROBLEMS OF HIGH-SCHOOL YOUTH

We have long been familiar with the main difficulties of personal and social adjustment of teen-age groups, but in some respects these difficulties are becoming distinctly more acute. People who are making a careful study of high-school youth today, especially in middle adolescence, know that these young folks are facing increasingly serious personal problems. These are difficult social and moral problems, more serious than their parents faced three decades ago, for, as we indicated in an earlier chapter, they are complicated by the elusive automobile and the general speeding up of modern social life, the break-down of home discipline, the weakening of old religious sanctions and time-honored social conventions, and with many new freedoms unaccompanied by any new self-controls. General Laxity seems to be in command. The old Puritanism has gone forever, but the new social

control has not yet been achieved. While a once-respected judge goes from city to city debating trial marriage, disguised under an attractive new name ("Compassionate marriage," a negro preacher in Cleveland calls it!), the citadel of adolescence burns with freshly kindled fires.

Yet idealism is still strong in the hearts of youth, and a wholesome purpose is usually found there "to live true, to right wrong, and to honor the king." In general our high-school youth are struggling for moral stability, for the supremacy of character and for spiritual victory. Inexperience and often lack of help at home make it difficult for them always to see clearly what is right and what is wrong. Conscience is dimly emerging from the shadows and speaks with rather uncertain voice. Self-confident and self-assertive in many ways, they are often dubious in the midst of the moral tangle of their complex young lives.

Thousands of them, in many high schools, have been interviewed by various people the past year to discover what they feel to be their chief personal problem. Frank, honest answers have been given, and a great variety of moral difficulties and social situations discovered. Problems as to the ethics of "dates," "pettings," "joy-riding," "pocket-flasks"

et cetera, recur frequently, recalling very similar, but less high-powered dangers in the slower days of buggy-rides gone by, but revealing far greater subtlety and variety in the temptations our modern youth must face.

No one could examine many hundreds of reports from these honest girls and boys without feeling the keenest sympathy with them and admiration for their moral earnestness, as they confess their chief character problem and reveal their need of clear-cut ideals and spiritual help. The following summary of problems reported, classified in seven convenient groupings, will be an interesting indication of the moral struggles of our sincere adolescent youth. These groups are not all mutually exclusive. To some extent they overlap, which accounts for the excess percentage.

Problems of school and future vocation	3 per cent
Problems of social pressure and imitation ..	11 per cent
Problems relating especially to religion	12 per cent
Problems of honesty and truth-telling	13 per cent
Difficulties with parents and relatives	15 per cent
Social relations with the opposite sex	32 per cent
(including acute sex problems, 11 per cent)	
Problems relating to social pleasures	42 per cent

Our data are sufficiently general so that these

percentages may perhaps be taken as fairly typical, indicating the kinds of difficulties our high-school youth are facing. At least it is clear that many of them are having trouble with their own parents and other relatives and that they all need the moral and spiritual help of sympathetic, intelligent and strongly Christian homes, that hosts of them are evidently not getting.

SOME SAMPLE PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL GIRLS

The following were selected more or less at random from the reports of high-school girls. In each case they represent the single outstanding problem which was giving the girl the greatest anxiety. They indicate a great variety of home and school situations as well as personal temperament and character.

How shall I keep myself from rebelling within against my mother, whom I do not understand very well and who I do not think understands me?[1]

How shall I conquer my feeling of inferiority?

Shall I go to a dance when my parents do not absolutely refuse to let me, but when they do not want me to?

[1] Most of these personal reports from high-school girls were shared with the author by Dr. N. E. Richardson of Northwestern University, a leading authority in the field of adolescence.

How shall I see the wrong in an act which I have done and my parents consider wrong, when I see nothing wrong in it?

Shall I leave home and spend the night with a friend, in order to give my sister, mother and myself an opportunity to think things over, after my mother has taken up with my sister and sent me to my room, after I lost my temper with them because my sister broke my beads and slapped me?

Shall I cheat on an important examination when the teacher is out of the room, and when I have been unable to prepare because of sickness?

Shall I use the notes I have taken to an examination, when I am nervous and do not want to use them, but do not know one question and can't write what I do know?

Shall I change the answer to a question in a completion test, when the teacher gives our papers back on the day after the test in order that we may finish it, and when I have looked up the correct answer in the intervening time? I want a better grade, and practically all the other pupils cheat.

Shall I keep the extra change which was given me by mistake when I bought my lunch at the school lunch-room, or take it back, when the girl at the register may be held accountable for it?

Shall I run off from school or skip a class for the fun of doing something I am not supposed to?

These are all exceedingly human, especially the last one, which shows the restlessness of an ex-

emplary child who was beginning to find her monotonously virtuous conduct rather irksome! Possibly the commonest attitude of all, at this age, is revealed in the first one. How characteristic it is for a girl to interpret every criticism and difference of opinion over conduct as a parent's failure to understand and sympathize! Number four was honestly puzzled over the parents' ethics, like another girl, who begged, "Don't tell me what to do, but why I should do it."

THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL PRESSURE

The most persistent question always in this connection is "*Why?*" And it suggests the need of patiently reasoning with our children. The following were from girls seriously troubled by problems of social pressure:

Shall I, while on a hike at camp, go swimming with other girls in order not to be considered a " 'fraid cat" when my camp guardian warned us not to swim in the river because of a dangerous whirlpool?

Shall I sacrifice my ambitions (ideals?) and drop to the level of the many high-school girls in order to be considered one of them?

How shall I make a girl who is jealous of me because I

am more popular than she stop telling untrue stories about me?

Shall I swallow my pride and return the friendship of a girl who is unable to gain the friendship of the other girls at school because of a scandal connected with another member of her family, when she seems to be doing the right thing, but when my friendship with her may result in my crowd either dropping me or possibly becoming interested in her?

Shall I after school take the "*chance*" I have to see a picture show which I want very much to see, but which will probably be back in a few weeks, or shall I go home and serve at a tea my mother is giving for a guest, when she does not give teas often and is expecting me to help her?

Shall I allow boys to kiss me in order to have dates, when the older girls do not seem to think it wrong, but every older person does?

The first in the above group suggests that "taking the dare" is not so common among girls as among boys, but is often a serious challenge, hard to decline, especially for girls with little independence who feel they must go with the crowd. Number two looks very alarming, but was probably caused by surprise over the low ideals of some few trusted friends. The last one is an old, old story, but the fancied social pressure is serious to many girls. Here again is a pathetic lack of

conviction as to just *why* the thing is wrong; highly characteristic of inexperience.

THE MORAL DANGERS OF JOY-RIDING

Many new complications of the ethical problems of girls have come with the automobile. Here are some typical varieties. Some indicate genuine embarrassments of sincere girls. Some suggest the dangerous new possibilities of a clandestine nature that have caused much worry in countless homes.

Shall I go in a car with a boy who has come to take me to a show, when he, knowing that my mother does not allow me to go out in a car at night, told her we were going for a walk?

Shall I tell my parents the truth when they ask me if I have been riding at night with a boy after the party to which I went was over, when my father has threatened to take away my privileges if he discovers that I have gone riding with a boy at night?

Shall I with another girl sit in the car at night until the rain stops sufficiently for the two boys with us to remedy the tire trouble, when passers-by may not understand why we are there; or shall I go to a near-by club-house?

Shall I continue to go out with a boy who tried to persuade me to smoke when I was riding with him one night?

Shall I tell my mother the truth concerning the way in which the fender of her car was bent while my sister had it,

when my sister has confided in me and asked me not to tell?

Shall I allow a boy friend to kiss me when we are riding in an automobile together?

Shall I with two other girls, while going to a Y.W.C.A. meeting at night, accept a ride offered by two boys, one of whom I have seen before, but neither of whom I know, when they are going in the same direction that we are going?

Shall I, while visiting in my old home town, refuse to go for a joy-ride with my cousin and her girl friend, both of whom have the reputation of being fast, and three of their boy friends whom I do not know, when I do not think my mother would approve?

Shall I, as president of our club, take the club members in my father's car to a little town thirty-five miles distant on our regular club night, instead of going to the theater or our club-room when we do not think our parents will ever know it?

It is rather appalling to think that the girl who raised this last problem was still in high school. The combination of high-school girls and a club-room and a "regular club night" and a roving six to whirl them seventy miles away, all unknown to parents who thought them quietly at a near-by theater, is certainly disconcerting. But that is what confronts the modern city home of luxury with its ultra-modern girls. It makes the automo-

bile look less desirable as a family toy. Possibly the point most likely to be overlooked in these cases is the fact that these girls are *all children*, or ought to be, but that they are being cheated out of their care-free childhood by the social precocity of city high-school life with its forced hot-house growth. These girls are all compelled to wrestle with complicated social problems with which they are not experienced enough to cope. Herein lies the subtle danger.

SOME HIGH-SCHOOL GIRL-BOY PROBLEMS

The childish language frequently reveals a pathetic immaturity confronted by serious sex temptations, and the boldness in some of the cases shows the extent to which the relations of high-school young folks have been recently complicated by new standards or loss of standards.

Shall I tell a boy friend I am sorry for him, or act as if I do not care what happens to him, after he has tried to pet me because of a bet he made, when I had formerly thought of him more as a brother than as a boy friend and when he is sorry he acted as he did?

Shall I refuse to dance with an unintroduced strange boy at a public dance to which I have gone with a boy friend?

Shall I refuse to go to a dance at a perfectly nice dining-place, when my parents object to the place, but when I have always wanted to go there to see what it is like?

Shall I refuse to drink, smoke and pet in order to keep my respect with myself and others when with a fast crowd who say I am not a sport and am "mamma's baby"?

Shall I go with one or many boys? Shall I lie to a boy and say that I kiss only him?

Shall I keep my word to the boy I love and kiss only him, when it is hard to do so because I have been used to necking them all?

How shall I, who am rather "devilish," convince boys in this fast and progressive age that I am nice?

Shall I refuse to drink at a dance where I know no one but the boy I am with, and when almost everyone else is drunk and they insist that I drink?

Shall I continue for several weeks to be angry with a boy friend whom I love and who while drunk and when we were riding with another couple tried to pet me too much, but apologized several times after he saw I was angry, and who is really sorry and likes me?

Shall I lie to my mother about my individual experiences with boys and my disobedience in returning later from a date than she asked me to, when I recognize her to be my best friend in everything else and when she wants to share my every secret, but who does not want me to marry because of the hardships of married life and the fact that I would have to leave her?

Shall I, who am moving to another section of the country, pet after I have acquired the habit, but have discovered a

girl to whom I was attached and who liked me dodged me because of my wild reputation, when I know a wild girl is a fool?

Shall I, who have grown up from childhood to girlhood overnight, become associated with a "he-school gang," some persons of which pet and some do not? Shall I pet, not pet, or drift aimlessly along, gradually learning to smoke and pet?

Out of this chaos of tumultuous impulses it is easy to draw pessimistic conclusions. These are human documents of deep suggestiveness and they are certainly not reassuring. Readers may lose sympathy with the coarseness of the last case, thinking that it comes from a distinctly lower level than their own home; but it is not a safe assumption, for these reports come from reputable high schools, from a fair cross-section of privileged American youth. The frankness is astonishing, but there is optimism in the fact that "petting," so often mentioned, is regarded as highly questionable playing with fire. The insidious thing about it is, the more attractive the fire seems, the less sure are they that it is really fire. The last case states so clearly the three moral alternatives—yielding, resisting or aimless drifting—that the girl's ideals still seem to be in control, though she

is evidently frightened. She seems to fear that her immaturity may mean lack of successful resistance.

SHALL MECHANISM OR IDEALISM WIN?

Back of all this confusion and moral groping is the child's ignorance of the true meaning and value of sex. The parents and the teachers who break the conspiracy of silence, which leaves the child all but helpless before these subtle temptations, are replacing the most dangerous ignorance with the armor and ideals of light, thus furnishing that inner control of impulses without which there is no true moral victory. Morbid curiosity is eliminated by simple sex instruction adapted to the age, and the great mystery of life gains beauty and dignity as true knowledge of it grows in the child's mind. Wide experience shows that parents gain greatly their children's love, respect and trust when they take them fully into their confidence by sympathetic sex guidance. This is best done under the expert direction of wise school men and women with their full coöperation. Dr. Washburne, Superintendent of Schools at Winnetka, Illinois, and

his tactful associates, have demonstrated this with fine results.[1]

This study of the social and moral problems of our older children, especially those in early youth, has convinced us of the complex seriousness of the situation. We have discovered that they have inherited all the problems of the past, accentuated by the nervous tension, the luxurious self-indulgence, the undisciplined freedom, and the prevalent thrill-chasing of the ultra-modern home. Where the problem is most acute, it is because the parents of the community have created it by their own emancipation from social and moral restraints.

Meanwhile the educational trend has recently emphasized mechanistic explanations of life at the expense of idealism. This has stealthily weakened the morale of our young folks, it cannot be denied. Teach life as merely a mechanism without a soul, and you destroy its spiritual meaning and high values. If all is blind mechanism, what becomes of moral responsibility and the sense of sin? If conduct is reduced to automatic response to stimuli, then bad character is nobody's fault. Insidiously this popular psychology is infecting the minds of

[1] See chapter on "Sex Education" in *Intelligent Parenthood.* The report of Proceedings of the Mid-West Conference on Parent Education, 1926. The University of Chicago Press.

our youth. They are coming to feel that if they simply cannot resist evil, because they are made that way, then the God or the Titan who made the mechanism of their impulses is to blame for their sins, and only he. Thus they conclude that what used to be sin in the old-fashioned days, is merely error, misfortune or "unsocial conduct." So they do not worry much about it. Such moral fatalism is deadly to conscience, ideals and character, especially when it is usually followed by the fading away of the personal God. Group standards displace conscience, and ideals are laughed out of court as troublesome dreams.

Perhaps it is fortunate, after all, that these ultra-modern homes have few children! Most children still come from the wholesome homes that have never heard of determinism or mechanism, and where God reigns and the soul still lives forever. However, even these homes and their children are not immune to the subtle spirit of the age which has complicated these problems of our youth. It is clear that even the children of old-fashioned homes usually become modern youth. They can never be equipped to meet their life problems without a religious interpretation of life that

can furnish them both ideals and the motive power to realize them.

"HOW SHALL WE DECIDE WHICH IS RIGHT?"

The ethical drifting of our young folks and their total lack of moorings is often revealed in their frank discussion groups under skillful leadership. Dr. Bruce Curry has led such voluntary groups in many colleges, and reports an unusually illuminating session with some students in California. They had apparently cast off all authority and were in a particularly critical mood toward their parents and the whole adult generation. In discussing the question, "How shall we decide which is right?" their first reaction was, "We should not do anything simply because our parents said we must." Then another asked: "Why don't they ever talk over their reasons with us? Do they ever think things through for themselves?" As the discussion ran on, it was rather natural that some one should suggest that the pleasant alternative be followed, rather than the unpleasant one. It was more reassuring when another advised doing the intelligent, rational thing, rather than the "dumb," foolish thing; and still another that we should

avoid the merely selfish thing and choose instead that which is "more than just selfish." How carefully he avoided using the word "unselfish," which evidently bored him, as savoring of cant!

As they warmed to the discussion, one suggested doing the creative thing, rather than the commonplace; another, the social rather than the anti-social. Another advised making the generous choice rather than the narrow-minded; and still another urged choosing the beautiful rather than the ugly or unlovely, suggesting the esthetic test that probably counts heavily with youth. Then they asked more general questions which showed their essential earnestness: "What is life all about, anyway? And why? And where does religion come in? And what about God?" The skill of the leader was shown in his leading them to fair agreement on the final proposition, "Well, if God is real, and not far off, but here, is he not the intelligent, creative, social, generous and beautiful Spirit of life? And if we decide to follow such choices as these, are we not really doing his will?"

Chapter X

The Religious Problem of Youth Today

The previous chapter discovered that the current life of our young folks is no green meadow path beside still waters. It is beset with social complications and moral dangers, all out of scale with their age and inexperience. The new freedom and the modern speed have thrown them into trying situations for which they are unprepared. Where shall they get the moral stamina, high purpose and sufficient self-control to stand these tests, which are often proving too much for their elders? They must find them in religion, whence comes most of our loyalty to high ideals. If religion is as broadly interpreted as modern needs require, the whole realm of character is religious. Then whatever has to do with moral issues must have religious values.

It will be illuminating to look at a few of the distinctly religious problems reported by the high-

school girls whose cases we were considering in the preceding chapter. Some practical perplexity of social life was usually uppermost in the minds of these children, so relatively few of them reported spiritual problems as their chief anxiety. Here are a few samples, both of the conventional and the unusual types:

What shall I tell my aunt whom I am visiting, if she asks me what the preacher's text was, when I went riding instead of going to church where my aunt thinks I went when we went riding?

How shall I help a brilliant but peculiar classmate who tells me how unhappy she is, says she has tried to be a Christian but cannot be, and desires to find the plan God has for her?

What shall I do, when I joined the church as a child, am considered a good Bible student, attend the church regularly, like the people and try to live straight; but have no religion and do not know what I believe, if anything?

This last case is decidedly worth analyzing. It is typical of many honest boys and girls who joined the church in childhood with little or no preparation. She has been faithful in church attendance and in the church school. She likes the church people and she tries "to live straight." But for

some reason she thinks she "has no religion," and her reason is probably because of her honest doubts. She does not know what she believes, "if anything." The very fact that this is the statement of a girl who gives it as her chief life problem shows that she is really an earnestly religious girl. She needs and wants the help of religion; but somehow is failing to get it from her church, though she is using faithfully all the opportunities it offers.

Her language is, quite unconsciously, a distinct reflection on her pastor and his program. She evidently got from him the idea that religion is just a matter of what one believes. Like too many ministers, he interprets religion mainly in intellectual terms, and she, naturally, could not understand him. Theology, the theory of religion, is necessary for adults; but it is useless to children, worse than useless, for it confuses and mystifies them, and then the more conscientious of them, like this case of ours, blame themselves for their perplexity. It was not her fault that she could not believe what her minister preached. It may have been to her credit—even if she understood him at all, which is doubtful.

This case suggests that children with the modern outlook need a really modern church. Too frequently the church speaks the language of long ago, and modern children cannot understand it. Even though the Gospel is old, it can be translated into the experience of each new generation. Our city and suburban schools are thoroughly modern. With greatly improved methods and equipment, they are meeting their growing pupils' needs in a natural way, and far better than the schools of the past. Many city churches are keeping pace with the progress of the schools; but many others are not, and suffer by comparison. The city high school which this girl attends has a socialized program which ties the school up to life. It teaches by projects and the pupils learn by doing. But her church is just a society for sitting still and listening, and chiefly for adults at that. Until the church becomes *a School of Christian Living*, and interprets its teaching concretely as a way of life, rather than a way of thinking or believing or just talking, it is not up-to-date enough to do much for modern children.

This girl—in fact, all the girls whose moral problems, stated in the previous chapter, appeal so strongly to our sympathy—needs a church which will not simply tell her about Regeneration, Election, Biblical Inspiration, Foreordination, the Immaculate Conception, the list of the Hebrew kings and other facts and theories of the distant past. *Our youth need help to live this very day.* They need actual training in meeting difficult situations in which character is either ruined or grows strong through victory. For instance, they have a suspicion that "petting" is wrong; but they want to know just *why* it is wrong, and they want the problem discussed sanely by a sympathetic teacher who understands their problems personally. They want to discuss why so many pupils cheat in school, just why it is wrong and how the habit can be conquered. They want guidance for their untrained consciences, to know what is really right and wrong, just how to treat their mothers, sisters, boy friends, teachers; and what to do about auto rides, dates, the theater, school clubs, picnics and all the rest. These practical problems of their daily lives are of vital importance to them, infinitely more important to them than the theologi-

cal theories which the preacher gets so wrought up over. The church school that has courage enough to start with these actual life situations as the basis of its curriculum and definitely aims its teaching to meet these youthful emergencies and needs will really train its young folks in religion, and will win their loyal gratitude.

THE YOUTH'S PROBLEM WITH THE BIBLE

Again the modern child who really thinks is perplexed about the Bible. Too often it seems just an old-fashioned book in an obsolete language, the English of three centuries ago. She finds in it some interesting stories, but many dull sections written too evidently for adults. If not rightly guided, she finds also some incomprehensible stories, some questionable stories and some doubtful ethics which stamp the book as a book of the shady past. The Bible will slip through her fingers unless we can show it to be a book of life. It seems to her to have little connection with ordinary people and with present-day living. She is too modern to worship or reverence a dead book, even though written by angels; but a real teacher can lead her to discover that the Bible is throbbing

with the human struggles of heroic men and women and will introduce her to the vital, pulsating lives of the prophets and apostles, some of whom seem strangely modern. Rescued from the mechanical theories of the Bible which make it a dead book from a dead past, she will find the life and love of God in it. She will also find there God's method with men whose lives are open to his powerful spirit.

Supremely she will find in the Bible the real Jesus. She has been taught his wonderful birth and Godlike life, but his majestic steps hardly seemed to touch the ground. Now in early teens she needs to discover the man Christ Jesus in all his deep sympathy and comprehension. In vivid imagination she needs to sit down with him by the well in Sychar, to look into his level eyes, to see on his hands the callous places and the scars of labor. She needs to come face to face with the Fisherman of Capernaum, the Carpenter of Nazareth and the Teacher of Jerusalem. She needs to make with him that first thrilling visit to the city, when his expanding adolescent soul caught fire with its experience of God. She needs to know Jesus in his young manhood, in his struggle with poverty, in his labor for the support of his mother

and sisters and brothers, and in his victory over those temptations in the wilderness. She needs to see visions with Jesus, visions of kindly helpfulness, of sympathetic service, of unflinching devotion to duty, of fearless attack upon graft with whip and lashing tongue, of victorious debates with enemies and precious companionship with congenial friends. She needs to feel the reality and simplicity of Jesus' own religion, to see how much God meant to him and how near he always was; to see how his trust in his heavenly Father kept him serene and untroubled and how wonderfully his life with God brought power into his life and made him a superman.

We need not fear that this face-to-face study of the real Jesus will lose for our youth the glory of his divinity. It will tear away the filmy veil that makes his features indistinct, puzzlingly obscure and vaguely divine; but they will see a new Godliness in the face of Jesus, as the divineness of his perfect character shines through, when they get near enough to know him as a living, breathing friend. Thus the Bible becomes priceless to our youth when they find there a true Master, a Saviour from a life of sin and failure, an Inspirer of all their youthful visions and ambitions.

THE NEED OF SEEING RELIGION LIVED

If the high-school girl, in the case quoted above, had had a really religious mother, or a teacher who lived up to her ideals, she never could have said, "I have no religion and do not know what I believe, if anything." Our youth must have true ideals of what it means to be a Christian, but unless these ideals are made flesh and live in human form, they have little power. It helps greatly to see these noble ideals perfectly incarnated in the life of the Christ. But they need to be translated in terms of purely human living, in the very world in which our youth is living himself.

All lessons of true heroism, by firing vivid imagination with daydreaming and starting the vital process of enthusiastic imitation, make their effective appeal to latent youthful heroism. The Old Testament yields some fine types of heroic living, also the New Testament with Paul, Peter and John and their comrades in the early church. Savonarola, Cromwell, Livingstone, Wilberforce and Howard are names to conjure with among hero-worshiping boys; and Joan of Arc, Florence

Nightingale, Virginia Dare and Edith Cavell have won much admiration from countless girls; but after all, to be perfectly convincing, the religious ideals must actually be seen in action.

Our youth must see religion lived in order to believe in it. Living demonstration is the final proof. Every group of girls needs the personal example and fine comradeship of a devoted young teacher of the right sort to whom they can look up and thoroughly respect. If she has a winsome personality and exemplifies high and noble ideals, she will grip the girls in intimate friendship and win their enthusiastic loyalty to her own ideals. Such a teacher can do more than any preacher to prove the reality of religion to young girls, and to stir in their souls the ambition to make their lives count to the utmost. She can discuss their most intimate problems with them and win their confidence and trust. Sometimes they will listen to her counsel more willingly than to the advice or commands of their older friends.

THE HANDICAP OF NON-RELIGIOUS PARENTS

But the religious problem of our youth today is doubly serious if they have irreligious or just non-

religious parents. Of course, many children go wrong in spite of praying fathers and mothers, but such exceptions attract double notice and often are widely advertised. A father's honest faith is the greatest stabilizer for a family—next to a praying mother. Where these are lacking, and the children do not see religion lived at home, they are doubly confused over religious questions, as the girl evidently was in the case we have just been considering. The religious neighborhood in which they live naturally draws them, with the other children of the group, to the church and what it symbolizes; while family loyalty, in a religiously indifferent home, runs counter to it, and the children are quite at sea.

The writer has noticed, in his experience with many families, that there are two periods in the life of a family when the father is apt to discover a new interest in religion—when the first child comes, and later when the growing children come to adolescence and face the social and religious problems it brings to them. "I wish I had known you ten years earlier," said a well-trained lawyer to a minister who had given him a fresh vision of the Bible and of the meaning of religion for the present age. At once he renewed his active con-

nection with his church, attended services regularly for the first time in twenty years, and was soon made a trustee. The minister had helped, but the deeper cause for that revival of personal religion was probably the lawyer's family. Two of the children were just getting to the point where their father's neglect of religion was troubling them. And this embarrassed him and set him to thinking. He was just in the mood to welcome the constructively modern ideas of religion which appealed to his well-trained mind.

In the ultra-modern home the religious problem of the young folks and the adults is essentially the same. It is the problem of the dispersion of interests in an overcrowded social program. No longer in such homes is there enough concentration of interest in religion to lift it to a place of prominence. It takes a rather humble place in the perspective, among a hundred other interests, each with some organization clamoring for attention and investment of time and personal interest. The motive of social ambition pushes the claims of everything else but the church, so the family religion is apt to suffer. However, the inherent need of the religious motives, to give stability to character, makes religion a perennial human interest,

and we return to this subject again in Chapter XIV. At this point in the discussion this much is clear: seldom are young folks more religious than their parents. If you wish for your children the moral safeguards of religion, you must take a genuine interest in religion yourself.

Chapter XI

Keeping Young with Youth

Among the subtle difficulties of the modern home is the task of keeping young with our children. The biggest chasm in life is the space between two generations. The most complacent aristocracy is the aristocracy of youth. No outsider can break in; and old folks are hopeless outsiders. It matters little how wise and experienced parents may be; strangely enough, their children will spurn their strenuous advice if they feel that they are old-fashioned. This is the arch-crime in the eyes of youth. To be old-fashioned is to be perfectly hopeless, quite beyond the pale, because you are of the past. Why this strange virulence against the past? Probably because sensitive youth resents misunderstanding and lack of sympathy, and feels that the older generation lacks its point of view, cannot see life as it is, and therefore cannot understand it. Obviously, to win or keep the confidence

of youth, to be trusted as confidants by your own children, you must do the impossible and keep young. No, it is not impossible—except as all difficult things are impossible, to those without faith.

BRIDGING THE CHASM OF THE AGES

In general, it must be acknowledged, the youngsters are right in this impression of middle-aged stolidity. "How dumb!" is their inner comment on much of the obtuseness of their elders. "He's slipping" they note, as, by some act of mature stupidity, father lives up to his bald spot. He shows that he has forgotten how it seemed to be a boy. He has lost touch with his own youth. The interests which absorbed him in his boyhood have been submerged in the colder tides of manhood. And what is worse, too often the idealism and the hero worship and the fine altruism of adolescent days have been lost in the glare of life's realism. Perhaps the iconoclastic days have come, the saddest in human life. He has smashed his own idols of youth. Imagination is dormant. Memory is dim and fickle. Boyish dreams and visions quite forgotten. And surest criterion of

age, his *feelings* have changed. He has lost his zest for life. His finer emotions and naïve enthusiasms have mysteriously slipped away, and with them his lost youth.

Somehow this tragedy must be prevented if we would keep the trustful sympathy of our children and thus preserve the unity of family life. Youth must pass, but youthfulness may be perennial. It is hopeless to keep young in years; equally so to keep young by frivolous manners or youthful dress or by allowing liberties with our Christian names. To hear a lanky, adolescent flapper call her gray-haired mother "Charlotte" or even "Lottie" is rather sickening. One suspects that the foolish mother encourages the liberty under the misconception that it helps to bridge the chasm of the ages. Instead, it makes the mother look even more foolish than she is, and quite self-conscious into the bargain. Such liberties undermine discipline and forfeit the children's respect.

NO ADMITTANCE EXCEPT TO THE CHILDLIKE

Perennial youthfulness is possible only for those who keep physically well, mentally alert and personally vital. The Young Man of Galilee was

the first to recognize and teach the importance of this, when he placed over the entrance to his Kingdom of Heaven the strangest *verboten* sign in all history: No Admittance Except to the Childlike. He evidently got little support from the prematurely old for his wonderful youth movement for the making of a better world. He saw that the average adult had lost his enthusiasm, his teachable mind, his believing heart, his trust and humility, his love for the beautiful, his unspoiled youthful idealism, and was thoroughly disillusioned. He had become a gnarled and knotted character, a creature of habits and prejudices, crochets and idiosyncrasies. No wonder the more Jesus saw of grizzled old weather-beaten fishermen like Peter, the more he liked unspoiled children! Jesus was the discoverer of the child in an old-folks' world. He aimed to keep his followers young in spirit, with plastic, teachable minds and believing hearts.

There is a strange pathos in the historic quest for the fabled fountain of youth, and in the patient alchemists' search for the elixir of life, and similarly in the experiments of modern surgeons in the transfer of ductless glands. All were on the wrong track, for the problem of perennial youth

is not chiefly physical, but spiritual. A man is as old as his arteries? Rather he is as young as his heart. For Youth is a spirit, and he that covets youth must youthful be, in spirit and in truth. Youthfulness is vitality. It is of the essence of life, the denial of death and of time.

We can keep young with our children by resisting vigorously the growing-old habit. This habit is due to worry, over-work and under-play, and dissipation greatly accelerates it. It is essentially a wasting of life, a dissipating of the life forces which are our working capital in the business of living. Worry is a process of mental disintegration. It is a dangerous variety of fear and a subtle form of unbelief. And it is strangely foreign to the experience of youth, which is too care free and light-hearted to worry. Someone has with fine insight said, "We do not stop playing because we grow old; we grow old because we stop playing." Play is the serious business of children, the exhilaration of youth and the salvation of middle life. Play breaks up the deepening grooves of the work habit and rescues a man from the growing slavery of his daily task. We really play in our spirits, and it brings back the mood of care-free childhood.

THE SHARING OF YOUTHFUL INTERESTS

If we would keep the spirit of youthfulness and retain our childrens' sympathy and confidence, we must persistently share their interests. We must do so not superficially but wholeheartedly, entering into their wholesome fun and their active games, intelligently and helpfully following along with their studies, keeping up with their reading and their music, and above all sharing their friends. Many adults do not have a solitary new idea, outside their own specialty, from one week-end to another. The exactions of our work get us into deep grooves mentally. One penalty for the specialization of life is the extreme difficulty of keeping up with general knowledge. The habit of study is easily lost. Many college graduates even lose the reading habit. Some colleges, like Amherst, have organized suggestive reading courses in various fields of science and human interest, to jog their alumni out of the deadly ruts of specialized routine living. Many parents have found it highly stimulating to follow along somewhat closely the children's course in college or high school. It keeps their own minds plastic and

helps to postpone old age. Whatever the children's interest, it keeps us young to share in it, and in the sharing we find a real comradeship, for community of interest is the basis of all comradeship.

Wise parents are learning that it pays to share some of their own plans with the children. It gives the boys and girls a sense of new dignity and helps them to share responsibilities. The family council should often include the children, when plans for the new house are discussed, and where to go for the vacation, and what to do with the garden this year. One advantage in farm life is the great variety of practical problems which can be shared with the children. They are not only educational projects of the finest type, but they provide a comradeship in work for old and young that should grow into a real partnership.

The real test comes, however, in the use of leisure time. Families that scatter for their fun are sure to grow apart. By this plan the parents lose fully as much as the children, though they may not realize it, in their selfish search for adult pleasures. By sharing with the children a fair quota of our Sundays and holidays we are surer to retain our youthful spirits, our capacity for whole-

some fun and natural pleasures rather than the complex and artificial ones. The family automobile, well filled with children, is a common sight any fair day, on American highways, and suggests to how great an extent this domestic custom has grown in recent years for the whole family to have their good times together. It is a way-mark of substantial progress, compared with the more dignified, adult-ruled last generation. This point needs very little arguing. We all know that the persistent effort to retain the youthful outlook on life and to gain constantly the youthful viewpoint on life's problems, through generous sharing of time in comradeship with our young folks, will surely win us the coveted honorary membership in the League of Youth, in spite of our whitening temples. The irrepressible Mark Twain must have deserved that honor, for his beloved wife's pet name for him was "Youth"!

Chapter XII

Our Attitude Toward Our Children

Fundamental in any home problem is the parents' attitude toward their children. And the prior question still is in their attitude toward having children at all. Doubtless the high birth-rate and large families in the past were partly due to the fact that children were an economic asset. With the specialization of life and the high cost of living, the time has come when children are no longer an asset but a financial liability.

On the farms, children are needed to help with the work. In fact, in most sections of rural America the profits are mainly due to capitalizing the labor of the women and children. Childless families can seldom make a good living on the farm. Does this explain the fact that the farm birth-rate is so much higher than the city birth-rate?[1]

[1] W. S. Thompson has shown that the rural birth-rate in the United States, according to data derived from the 1920 census

Children are twice as welcome on the farms as in the city. The farms can use them. Most city homes cannot. Farm children early learn to "pay for their keep." In the poor city homes, which have the most children, the boys and girls soon learn to shift for themselves and are of slight expense to their parents.

CHILDREN NO LONGER AN ECONOMIC ASSET

But in educated urban families the cost of rearing children has alarmingly increased in the past generation, while their income-producing has vanished. They are a financial liability now from birth almost to marriage. Just for the items of medical and hospital costs of his child's birth, a father now pays ten times, or twenty times, what his own birth cost. The child stays in school twelve years; twenty if he completes a professional training. Meanwhile his expense to his parents is probably one-tenth to one-fourth of the family in-

(more accurately "the ratio of children under five years to women"), is 38.81 per cent greater than the urban birth-rate, in spite of all the immigrant families in the cities. The difference is much greater than this in the South and the Central West, the less urbanized and industrialized sections of the country. See chapter on "Natural Increase of Population," in Dublin, Louis I. (editor), *Population Problems.* Houghton Mifflin Company.

come, or even more, at the peak of the educational load.

Hence our best educated homes, where ideals for the future of their children are the highest, do not have children enough to reproduce themselves. Statistics show that men college graduates average less than two children, and graduates of women's colleges less than one. Even if the unmarried graduates are left out, the showing as regards children is not much better. The married graduates of Yale and Harvard do average two and half children per family; but the married graduates of Vassar and Wellesley average less than two children, and of Bryn Mawr less than one.[1] Quite evidently the educated have an effective knowledge of birth control. It is equally evident that the families applying such knowledge are the families whose children are a heavy economic liability, not a financial asset.

The same is true of well-to-do families to a large extent, whether or not the parents are well educated. Wherever children threaten the social aspirations of the parents, both by the expense involved and by interfering with freedom and leisure, selfishness and social ambition dictate small

[1] Popenoe, Paul, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

families or none. The extremely rich are notable exceptions. Often millionaires have five children or more. In two recent studies of millionaire groups, the average millionaire home was found to have six children. Naturally this is apt to be less true of the *nouveau riche* than of the old families who have had time to "found a dynasty."

ARE CHILDREN A FAMILY HANDICAP?

"Of course," says a keen mother, "children are no handicap to the very wealthy. They may seldom see the children, unless they choose, for servants usually bring them up." But in families obliged to live in apartments, children often seem a positive burden. Apartment life is such a menace to the welfare of children, some friends of children are not sorry that so many apartment managers exclude children entirely. Yet this attitude has surely increased the prevailing sentiment among flat-dwellers that children are a positive handicap, and this feeling is the chief motive in companionate marriage. The dreaded danger of unwelcome children postpones countless marriages, especially in the professional classes. Young doctors, lawyers and teachers rise slowly in their professions and are

apt to regard children as anything but an asset. Advocates of the arrested family plan claim that this is the only sort of marriage now possible for such men, with the present high cost of children.

Families of business men also are likely to be small because of the social ambitions of both the father and the mother. In few communities does it improve a woman's social standing to be the mother of five or six children. Barrenness no longer carries the social stigma of the past, which was so often unjust. Rather today is the childless woman envied by the superficial because she is "free." Such freedom is bought at the high cost of a childless old age, often very pathetic and lonely.

But many do not think of this, in their years of feverish activity when selfish pleasures and social rivalries make children seem an utterly unwelcome burden. As Popenoe remarks so incisively, "The first great disservice which the birth-control propagandists have done the family is to talk as if children were an intolerable burden, a curse to be avoided at almost any cost. A child or two may be endured in case of necessity, but every pregnancy is for the mother a step toward the grave, for the father a step toward bankruptcy, for both a step toward slavery. Nothing could be more untrue.

Child-bearing is desirable in order that people may be happy individuals and good citizens."[1] But though the child seldom brings the mother to the grave or the father to bankruptcy, it does involve them both in obligations, and if they are selfish individualists, pleasure-seekers or social climbers, then the newcomer is sadly unwelcome and the parents curse their bad luck and name the baby *Finis*.

MUST SUPERIOR FAMILIES DIE OUT?

We do not wish to infer that the types described above are superior families; nor that all childless homes are childless from choice. Many childless families would gladly welcome children and many very wisely adopt them. By superior families we mean the *healthy, happy and productive families who are contributing to human progress.* They are the true aristocracy. Whether they are rich or poor has nothing to do with it, and rank or social standing very little. It is well known that many of the wealthy and socially prominent are not producers but parasites, and their families are eugeni-

[1] Popenoe, Paul, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

cally inferior. The fewer children they have the better for society.

We must face the fact, however, that human progress depends very largely on the survival of the truly superior families. And unfortunately, very many of them are disappearing. As Sherwood Eddy recently pointed out in *The Christian Century*, "We allow criminals, idiots and the feeble-minded to produce their prolific offspring, while the best strains are not reproducing themselves." Fortunately, many of the next generation in America are being born on the farms; but most of the rest are coming from the slums and lower classes in the cities, and from the newer immigration. Coal-miners and bootblacks, according to a recent bulletin from the Census Bureau, still average eight children per family, and unskilled laborers seven.[1] They are chiefly new Americans. But now that immigration is so closely restricted, and even the rural birth-rate is declining, the population growth of the United States is slowing down decidedly, especially in the older East where the native white families are doomed to extinction.[2]

[1] Popenoe, Paul, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

[2] Our increase in population was 3.6 per cent per year in 1810; 3 per cent in 1880; but only 1.5 per cent in 1920. See

This problem is just as critical in England as in America. An English writer, deploring the lowering birth-rate in the superior families in his own country, uses this vigorous language: "England's second duty is corollary to the first. It is to censure all those who, stricken with that wasting sickness, hyper-egoism, refuse to add to the brain and muscle of the Empire, lest their pleasures and dissipations should be inconveniently curtailed thereby. The crazy dance of life which these persons lead is immoral, because, while damaging the individuals who pursue it, it does no real good to anyone else. Finding three or four children tiresome because they interfere with the daily round of excitements, these egoists determine to have only one or two, or perhaps none at all. Here indeed lies a very real danger. Unless this is well guarded against, *there can be no national progress. For it is as important that the right people should be born as that the wrong people should not be born.*" [1]

It should be clearly understood that, although we can still have progress without increasing population, we cannot hope for progress without *the*

Cox, H., *The Problem of Population,* p. 8. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

[1] Crackanthorpe, Montague, *Population and Progress,* p. 82. London, Chapman & Hall.

survival of the best. It will not be denied that the abler, better-educated and successful families, especially in the cities and the suburbs, are either dying out in the present generation or leaving few representatives to carry on the torch; while their places are filled by ambitious, vigorous types from the lower social levels, who in turn are likely to pass, in another generation, when infected by the prudence of the prosperous. How long can this process of filling the ranks from the bottom continue without permanently altering the American people?

IS A DIFFERENT FAMILY ATTITUDE POSSIBLE?

Such a future as the present trend of population indicates is surely not promising. It raises the important question: What can change the family attitude of the better American homes upon which the future progress of the race depends? How shall we create *a new idealism to offset the new cynicism* about children because they are no longer a financial asset? They are still "the poor man's life insurance." But the thrifty and prosperous reverse the proverb and *buy* life insurance for the protection and even the future support of their

children. Granted that children are and have the right to be a financial burden, cannot a good case be made that they are worth it?

Of course there are many disappointments, but usually the truest happiness of a family is in its children. The chronic pleasure-seeker forgets this, if, in fact, he ever discovered it. With all the expense and anxiety they bring, the boys and girls bring infinitely more joy than trouble into life. Without them the wealthy home is poor indeed. The childless home is sincerely to be pitied. The joy of watching the baby, for every home a fresh miracle of life; the happiness of seeing the boys and girls develop and grow strong; the satisfaction of helping the young folks prepare for their life work and get adjusted to it; and then the supreme delight in the grandchildren!—has wealth or fame any deeper satisfactions for the human heart than these? Nothing for which the happy father or mother would barter their children. It goes without saying.

THE INFINITE WORTH-WHILENESS OF CHILDREN

But the worth of the children to the parents does not depend merely upon the happiness they

bring. Quite aside from the happiness involved, or even when the children prove a greater care and anxiety than joy, the experience of parenthood develops the parents and completes the family. Without children the home life is so vastly different in its social and spiritual values that it makes a subtle difference in the personal development of the husband and the wife. As human personalities they lack completion and fulfillment without the child. Sometimes a closer mutual life partially makes up for their loss. But often the character values which children help develop are lacking, and growing selfishness takes their place. We have only to think of the world's loving admiration for the Madonna, the symbol of universal worship of the glory of motherhood, to remind ourselves that we owe the highest attainments of human character to the experience of parenthood. *It is really an open question, whether children need their parents more than parents need their children.*

To say that the childless are not good citizens would be obviously unjust, though they are not complete citizens, bearing their full share of the racial load and community responsibility. Celibate priests have long fathered other men's children, and most communities have a few popular uncles

and grandpas-at-large whose benevolence has proved their thoughtfulness of children, and incidentally their heart hunger for the children who never came to their own home. Splendid citizens, of course; but they are the exception to the rule that childless families, when childlessness is intentional, easily grow selfish and self-indulgent, and are much more apt to separate and seek divorce. Only one-third of divorced couples have children.[1] The child not only really makes the family, but tends to make it permanent. A child is good insurance against a broken home. Two or three children are still better, and large families very rarely are broken by divorce.

THE NEW APPRECIATION OF CHILDHOOD

There is good reason to think that the priceless value of children is getting to be more generally appreciated. Legislation has recognized their rights more justly and now protects them more adequately from exploitation. The marvelous generosity of all American cities now in providing com-

[1] "Compared with the period 1887-1906, the proportion of cases of divorce in families with children had decreased in 1922 from about two-fifths to slightly over one-third."—Groves, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family,* p. 149. J. B. Lippincott Company.

plete school privileges for them, the development of city parks and play facilities, the rising standards of child hygiene, the fine new hospitals for children, the growth of periodicals for the child and the home, the development of scientific child study and genetic psychology, the multiplicity of books about and for children, the more adequate care of orphans, the increasing popularity and success of adoption, all indicate that children are at last coming to their own. More and more people are discovering them to be the most precious possession in life, without which complete well-being is quite impossible. And the best result of the declining birth-rate is the fact that the children are having a much better chance except, possibly, in the disappearing families with only one child. They are not only better clothed and fed, but have a better educational and social opportunity than in homes overcrowded with children.

The child's first right is the right to be *welcome* to the home to which he comes. It must be that children are more precious where they are few. Certainly the homes with few children usually take greater precautions to protect them from danger and sickness than the homes that are rich only in off-spring. Hence the wonderful decrease in child-

mortality which has so largely offset the falling birth-rate and is the clearest index of rising civilization. Practically all countries showing a falling birth-rate show also a rapidly falling infant mortality-rate, proving that the fewer the children the greater the care. In England and Wales in the past half-century, the birth-rate has fallen from 35.4 to 20.1 per thousand of population; but meanwhile the annual mortality rate per thousand infants under one year fell from 149 to 91. And it is worth special notice that among the professional classes, with fewer children than the average, the infant mortality is only from 39 to 48 per thousand babies (in doctors' and lawyers' families, respectively), only half the average rate.[1] It is ominous that fewer babies come to our superior homes, but because those that come are better born and better reared, better protected and better appreciated, it is the greatest day for childhood our old world has ever known.

[1] See Cox, H., *The Problems of Population*, pp. 116-117. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Chapter XIII

Home Tyranny, Anarchy or Democracy?

A modern educator at a recent conference on vocational guidance delivered himself of this vigorous opinion: "I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion the children of today do not need vocational guides so much as they need a new set of parents: parents who have spunk enough to climb back upon the thrones in their own households which they have abdicated in favor of their children; parents who have energy enough to get their children out of bed in the morning early enough for them to wash their faces, comb their hair, and lace their shoes without the school's being obliged to give promotion credit for their doing so; parents who, when the shades of night begin to fall, look after their boys with the same degree of care that they give to their bull pup, which they chain up, lest he associate with the strange cur upon the street. We have state autocracy enough in edu-

cation; what we need most is authority in the home."[1]

This amusing outburst reveals more energy than discrimination, and engages our sympathy more than it commands our approval. The "throne" allusion is unfortunate, for it gives the author away. It subtly suggests that he is a tyrant in his own home, or, more likely, would be if his wife would let him. Or possibly this was just an explosion of a suppressed desire which in his domestic meekness he would never have ventured to express at home. At all events, it serves to open to us the tangled problem of family discipline, at the heart of which is the question that we introduced in the preceding chapter. Our attitude toward our children will largely determine our solution of the discipline problem.

THE OLD-TIME HOME DESPOTISM

The old Puritan home, and in fact most patriarchal homes of the past in which parental responsibility was taken seriously, was very evidently an

[1] Quoted anonymously by Weigle, L. A., in *The Training of Children in the Christian Family.* The Pilgrim Press.

absolute monarchy. The father was a patriarchal despot. The larger the retinue of children and other servants about the throne, the more patriarchal it was, the stronger the sense of authority. The old-fashioned father doubtless loved his children, but it was not good taste in those days to let them know it. It tended to undermine authority, at least that was the theory, and such weakness was unforgivable in a parent.

In this despotism the child enjoyed all the rights and prerogatives of a subject. Instant obedience was expected of him, without ever stopping to ask why. Most children, and wives too, soon found acquiescence the better part of valor. This habit of unquestioned authority had a bad effect on the Puritan father. It confirmed him hopelessly in his opinion of his own sovereignty and made him believe conscientiously in the divine right of his domestic kingship. If his wife had any heretical suspicions to the contrary, she tactfully kept them to herself. That the old-time home was not oftener rent asunder by open rebellion was doubtless due to the loving shrewdness of diplomatic mothers. I believe it was Dean Briggs who said that the Pilgrim Mothers deserve even greater credit for superb

heroism than the Pilgrim Fathers, for in addition to enduring the rigors and hardships of pioneering, they also had to endure the Pilgrim Fathers!

There is reason to fear that this rigid discipline was especially austere in the homes of the godly, and that their strenuous theology had much to do with it. It was derived chiefly from the austerities of the Old Testament rather than the tenderness of the New. The long-popular proverb, "Spare the rod and spoil the child," is not in the Bible, though many a sermon has probably been preached from it. The original text is this: "He that spareth his rod hateth his son, but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes" (Prov. 13:24). There may have been some, even in those days, who hated the rod and spared the child, but history did not make such weaklings famous. The historic *New England Primer*, first text-book in American schools, running through three hundred editions during two centuries, has this suggestive final paragraph:

> Thus end the days of woful youth,
> Who won't obey nor mind the truth;
> Nor hearken to what preachers say,
> And do their parents disobey.

They in their youth go down to hell,
Under eternal wrath to dwell.
Many don't live out half their days,
For cleaving unto sinful ways.

The inspiration for this somber poet was doubtless found in the article on "Original Sin" in the Catechism a few pages earlier in the same book: "The Sinfulness of that Estate whereinto Man fell, consists in the Guilt of Adam's first Sin, the want of righteousness and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called Original Sin, together with all actual Transgressions which proceed from it." [1] All the stubborn disobedience, the occasional revolt against paternal tyranny, the sullen silence of acquiescence, and even the frivolous desire for play, and other expressions of natural instincts, were accepted as evidences that the hearts of children were desperately wicked. The fact that they were born so was really no credit to their parents, but the latter seemed to take no discredit therefor!

The paternal tyranny, then, in the old-time family, was a constant repression of the natural im-

[1] *The New England Primer*, Twentieth Century Reprint. Ginn & Company. Book unpaged, and author unknown.

pulses of children. The fact that this was done conscientiously, essentially as a part of religion, made it none the less pernicious. It must have done irreparable harm to many high-spirited children and youth. It was an insult to personality to give a growing boy no voice whatever in his own management. To exact unquestioning obedience of him under all circumstances, especially when the father, not fully informed, was in the wrong, and the boy knew it, was as unjust as slavery and similar in principle. The practice was apt to make hard, stern men grow more severe, and high-spirited, independent youth still more rebellious; while the pliable and easily-mastered had the spirit of initiative crushed out of them in their dutiful submission. In general, of course, it was a benevolent despotism, and love, though disguised, was on the throne. Wise mothers, too, were often able to stave off conflicts and prevent clashes of wills. So that in spite of its austere atmosphere of authority, the old-time home with its noble ideals, deeply religious spirit, and strong family loyalty, succeeded in developing generations of sturdy character and usually held the respect and to a high degree even the gratitude of its children.

Here and there in rural life one may still find such homes where the father's will is law; for some of our contemporaries are still living in the past. And in immigrant homes in the cities similar tyranny is usually attempted. It succeeded in the old country, but is having rough weather here. Perhaps nowhere is the revolt of youth against parental authority more acute just now than in such homes, and the distressing chasm between the generations is therefore widening. Russian Jews, for instance, whose clever children, formerly docile and very submissive, are now asserting boldly their independence of their parents, are throwing the blame on the lawless spirit of America for this crisis in their family life.

THE ANARCHY IN ULTRA-MODERN HOMES

But something very different may be found in most of our ultra-modern homes. Partly in reaction from their own suppressed childhood and honestly desiring to give their children freedom to grow and be happy, our "emancipated" families have gone to quite the opposite extreme. From magazines and woman's club discussions they have learned the doctrine of the self-determination of

children. They have been led to believe in the gospel of free expression. In shunning repression they encourage *expression* in the extreme, allowing their children almost absolute freedom to follow their personal interest and impulses—in other words, to do as they please! This is far more popular with the children than with the neighbors; for a single family of unrestrained children will soon have a whole neighborhood by the ears.

This gospel of Rousseau has its very attractive appeal and is vividly defended by its adherents. The chief trouble is, when allowed free course, to run to its consistent extreme, it just doesn't work. It is simply *domestic anarchy*, due to sheer abdication of parental responsibility. With a single child it is less disastrous, but where there are several the clashing of desires to express childish freedom soon results in the freedom to fight. And with older children naturally this domestic anarchy results in a fine demonstration of "individualism run amuck" which we discussed in an earlier chapter. The quickest way to make a home a lawless place of self-indulgence and the headquarters of a centrifugal, decentralized family, is to adopt this theory of family discipline. Let every one "express himself" with the utmost freedom and home anarchy

will soon reign. Better the tyranny of the old parental despotism, if the choice must be made. But such a choice is now impossible. The whole trend of the age is against it.

A TRUE FAMILY DEMOCRACY

However, so far as contemporary homes in American cities and towns are concerned, we have been speaking of rather rare and contrasting extremes. Most of our homes have caught the spirit of the age, without losing their moorings, and have grown rather naturally into family democracies. Such is the wholesome modern family, a democratic little group in which the rights of all are safeguarded by their mutual love and the parents lead but do not tyrannize. There is no throne, or any high-chair despot.

Among the simple principles of this home democracy is first of all a mutual respect for personality. The child is really a person. How strange we were so slow in discovering it! As such, he has personal rights, which may not with impunity be disregarded. His body, mind, and soul must be respected, not abused or insulted, or overburdened with expectation unsuited to his years. A genuine

reverence for personality will prevent much of the rough, unfeeling discipline which went with the old-time parental tyranny.

But obedience to law is necessary in any society, and the customs of the home will be observed even when the family is a frank democracy in which the children personally share. The superior experience and wisdom of the parents deserve and receive the respect of the children so long as their decisions are fair. Obedience must not crush individuality, however, and must always be a reasoning obedience to reasonable requests, rather than blind obedience to peremptory orders. The latter irritates and stunts initiative; the former conciliates and develops character.

To this end the child has a right to all necessary and reasonable explanations, when the parents' wishes are but half understood or their judgment questioned. Very often the question "Why?" is raised. It never pays to refuse to welcome it. The confidence of "the third estate" in the home democracy must at all hazards be retained. "Let's sit down and talk it over" is the right attitude to clear away differences and retain confidence. It prevents many a threatened breach and makes discipline unnecessary, for it keeps the child a member of the

family council. It is a great gain for him to feel that he "belongs" and that his voice really counts, just so far as his experience warrants.

The child also has an inherent right to be trusted, unless he proves himself untrustworthy, which is very unlikely. In a beautiful way, trust often increases trustworthiness and gives a new sense of dignity and self-respect. It is a fine way to encourage a child to acquire real manliness. Closely akin is the child's right to share responsibility in accordance with his growing manliness. Irresponsibility is a perfectly normal phase of childhood. The tender child should not feel on his shoulders the least of the world's burdens. But as adolescence dawns, one of the means of outgrowing childishness is the gradual fitting of the lesser burdens to the youthful shoulders, that they may grow strong with exercise and manly character be developed. Learning to take responsibility is fine social practice. It makes a boy or girl dependable and builds up the family morale splendidly. Thus the family democracy becomes no mere fiction, but a working reality, an active fellowship in the exhilarating enterprise of mutual living, on the basis of mutual trust, responsibility and freedom, with full respect

for one another's personality and loyalty to the accepted *mores* and ideals of the beloved group.

Some may feel that this ideal for the family is too good to be true. "Someone must be the head," you may say, "and democracy is too weak to work." There is still a fairly general opinion that the only way to stop family quarrels is to maintain a paternal autocracy. It is a devastating theory, for it has to be maintained by force. Doubtless male force has kept many a family submissive and free from quarrels. It is very amusing, however, that among the lower classes, where such courtesies are still orthodox, it is much harder now for the men to maintain their vaunted masculine supremacy, for the hard-working women are often more muscular than the men! Tending machines does not keep up the men's muscles, but housework and gardening have made the women strong. Thus many a despot has been dethroned!

Nor is perfect freedom from family differences a proof of the perfect home. Beware the home where there is never a dispute or shadow of a quarrel. It is fairly good evidence that somebody is tyrannizing, playing the king on the family throne. The quiet submission of some homes is too ominous. Indian homes are said to be like that; and there's

often a reason. Where there is only one will in the family, it seems to simplify the problem of discipline; but it insults the personality of the wife and the children. Democracy has its complicated difficulties, in the home as elsewhere. Yet the cure for the ills of democracy is never found in a dictatorship, but in a better and fairer democracy. A domestic Mussolini might quell home quarrels, but would hardly be American.

Chapter XIV

How Religion Stabilizes the Family

President Coolidge was not merely uttering a pious bromide when he recently said, "*The greatest need of America is religion, the religion that centers in the home.*" Our discussion of the family thus far has led us through a bewildering maze of clashing interests, social strains and changing standards. It is worth noting that most optimists on this problem are the people with religious faith. The others have lost faith in the family as an institution, and are calling for "new *mores*," in fact for a new sort of family altogether, in accord with their new ideas of freedom.

If anything can stop this pagan trend of ultra-individualism which is breaking up so many homes, it is the religion of Jesus Christ. For centuries that has been the inspiration of countless families, and there is no denying that the homes where the Christian spirit restrains natural selfishness are

having the least trouble with these modern problems. For instance, *divorces in religious families are exceedingly rare.*[1] Some might claim that this is due to the fact that the religious homes are old-fashioned homes, still bound by ancient tradition, into which modernism has not yet successfully come with its new radical ideals and its new freedom. Consequently such homes, not being up-to-date, are backward socially and the women in these families are more submissive and slow in claiming their full independence. Hence the changing social standards have not complicated these homes greatly and the old-fashioned family remains intact and reasonably complacent.

This is true in a measure, but is hardly fair to the facts, for religious homes are in the majority, and they are not by any means all socially backward or old-fashioned. So high an authority on sociology as Giddings of Columbia once expressed an opinion about the church, of which many need to be reminded. It was in his sociological seminar, after a graduate student had made some derogatory remark about the church. Dr. Giddings replied, "Think what you will of the church, but remember one thing: The best people in the community have

[1] See data on p. 206.

always been in the church, and they will always be found there." Religion is naturally a conservative force, but religious people are not all conservatives. There are many progressives among them who are interpreting religion in terms of modern life. They are thoroughly modern people, but they are not the group that are seeking divorce or family rehabilitation. Nor are they to any extent interested in companionate marriage. Religious homes are usually happy and successful. There is where marriage is no failure.

WHERE RELIGION IS ONLY AN HEIRLOOM

There are homes, of course, in which religion is just one of the family heirlooms. Heirlooms are ancient things that are out of style. They are not for current use, nor especially for ornament, but they contribute to the family pride and provide historic background and something of social standing. It gives considerable *éclat* to a family to be able to refer to a great-grandfather who was in the Colonial ministry. It is almost as respectable as a Cape Cod spinning-wheel or a *Mayflower* chair! And in such homes it is considered highly appro-

priate for all over sixty to be religious; for religion is supposed to be old-fashioned.

This attitude is easily understood when you discover such people's idea of religion. They often think of it merely in terms of creed, ritual and other-worldliness. For many such people, religion is largely a formal matter, and is supposed to be chiefly concerned with preparing one for safe arrival in the next world. They can hardly conceive of its having any present usefulness. No wonder they treat such old-fashioned religion as an heirloom. It ought to be treated that way. It is a poor sort of religion that has little if any effect upon current life, character and conduct. Whatever insurance such religion may have on happiness in the next world, it has no insurance on successful family life in the present. The acid test of religion is to help folks involved in the social complications of modern living to solve the problems of the family. When sincere and genuine a modern man's religion will do it. Probably nothing else can.

WANTED: A RELIGION THAT AFFECTS LIFE

It is time that reasonable people agreed that religion is not a scheme to avoid the wrath of God, but

a plan to better the lives of men. Worship is an important part of it, but it is not a mere form of worship or belief. It is far more than ritual, sacrament or cult. It is a wonderful way of living, as natural as it is spiritual. "*Religion is the human experience of God's life and love, in the midst of our ordinary tasks. It is the life of love, faith and service of God and fellow-men, in accordance with the ideals and purposes of Jesus Christ. That is, it is* THE JESUS WAY *of thinking, feeling, doing and being, throughout the whole scope of daily living, especially in relation to the supreme values of life.*" [1]

Our Father God is the Infinite Spirit of Efficient Good Will. The Christian is the person in whom this Spirit dwells. This Jesus Way of Life will lead the Christian into loving worship of God and the friendly life of good will and fair play. These are the tests of real religion; their supreme first tests are always *at home.* If the religious motives and purposes work out anywhere sincerely, they work out in the home. If a man's religion is worth anything to his character, his family know it first. Millions of Christian homes in America attest the

[1] Fiske, G. W., *Purpose in Teaching Religion,* p. 30. The Abingdon Press.

fact that this is so. The writer has for twenty-one years had keen graduate students from Japan, both Christian and Buddhist, in the same classes with Americans. They are less impressed by the fact that one American home out of seven is now ultimately broken by divorce than they are by the fact that *probably 98 per cent of our really Christian homes are never broken up at all, because their religion is the best possible insurance against it.*

The writer makes the above statement confidently, after corresponding with ministers of several denominations in sixty-one parishes in fifteen states, representing all parts of this country. These ministers were men of high standing in the ministry, with many years of experience, mostly in long pastorates, and a reputation for faithfulness as pastors. They know their people. From these men, data have been gathered relative to 22,001 church-going white families, including 16,940 communicant families, whose family history has been known by their pastors for many years, while they were their pastors and since. In this large number of family groups, we have been able to discover only 196 divorces. This is somewhat less than 1 per cent. And of this number, only 117 divorces were among church members or two-thirds of 1 per cent.

Even doubling the number, to allow for possible error, it is safe to say that, although divorces in America are now one-seventh as numerous as the marriages, nearly all of them are among non-religious people, for our data safely indicate that less than 2 per cent of church-attending white families and perhaps 1 per cent of communicant families have any experience with divorce.

Reports from 1,500 negro families in three parishes in Georgia, New York and Massachusetts, show a much higher liability to divorce. The 80 cases reported make 5.3 per cent, or six times the percentage among church attending whites, though very much lower than the rate for the total population.

There are some very sound reasons why the religion of Jesus helps to reduce family difficulties to the minimum. In the first place it teaches a real reverence for personality. It gets us into the habit of regarding the rights of others. It makes people more considerate. Its outstanding quality is kindness, differentiating it from all other religions. As it accustoms us to be thoughtful of others it helps us to overcome selfishness. Certainly the more Christian one is, the less selfish he is. The whole movement of Christianity histor-

ically is against self-indulgence, and this is a strong symptom in the disease of selfishness. This and the extreme individualism to which it leads are causes of most family troubles.

The religion of Christ, to be sure, has exalted the individual and has fostered the rise of democracy, but its individualism is not the selfish kind that ignores the rights and crushes the feelings of others. It encourages the individual to make the most of himself, but not at the expense of others. It teaches him the religious necessity for coöperation, and the home is the laboratory where this team-work is first learned. Religion stabilizes the family because it teaches the finest kind of team-work and develops character in the process.

Religion also helps in the conservation of the family, because it is a source of the truest spiritual motives. This is the point where religion comes in and renders a unique service. "The soul of all culture is the culture of the soul," says Macdonald. It furnishes a spiritual interpretation of life. It provides a strong enduring basis of ethics, in the very character of God. It supplies the noblest ideals as standards of conduct. But above all it injects the spiritual motive power to realize these ideals and put them into life. This spiritual

power in religion, which no other human experience can furnish, comes from a vital relation with God. It is no empty phrase to say that the sincere Christian depends upon God's help for his daily living. For millions this is a reality, in proportion to their faith and trust.

HOW HOME RELIGION BECOMES EFFECTIVE INSURANCE

It is evident that the reality of home religion and its practical effectiveness varies greatly, from the exceedingly devout family with the piety of the mystic, to the superficial modernist household whose religion is an annual fad, a part of the social routine of Lent, and causes very little trouble the rest of the year. But it is difficult to fool the children. Home religion is not likely to survive the generation that makes it a mere veneer. Really to convince the children, you must have a genuine belief in God of which you are not ashamed. You must show a consistent reverence for Christ and all the highest values in life, shown in word and deed. There need be nothing of the old Puritan sternness, but essential earnestness must be the gen-

eral attitude toward life, not constant frivolity and utter lack of seriousness.

It makes a vast difference whether religion is regarded as an elective, to be taken or left according to present convenience, or one of the necessaries of life. If the parents are frankly loyal to religion as the first essential in life, not an out-worn, old-fashioned thing, like an heirloom, the children's respect for religion may be taken for granted.

It helps greatly if there is a frank naturalness in speaking of religious experience as a normal phase of living, not as a separate compartment of life isolated from the rest, but the inner inspiration of it all. When this is revealed in the regular custom of brief family devotions or expressing the thanks of the household in the words of grace at meals, it is a genuine blessing to the home. There is no real substitute for home religion and its honest, frank expression. It must ring true. But when it does, it gives the home an atmosphere that nothing else can give, in which family loyalty, unity and mutual love thrive and grow beautiful and strong.

Chapter XV

The Religious Dedication of the Home

Many sincere people realize the importance of a religious atmosphere in the home and a definite Christian purpose; and they wish to signalize the fact in some act of consecration. Accordingly, an interesting custom has sprung up recently, the religious dedication of a new home. It met with immediate popularity. It is not simply a custom for newly-weds, though very appropriate for them. It is a happy custom especially for people who are leaving an old home for a new house just built for their occupancy, which they dedicate, with prayer and song and the unveiling of lovely pictures, to a finer and nobler home life in the spirit of Christ.

THE ORIGIN OF A BEAUTIFUL CUSTOM

This interesting plan originated in 1926 with Professor H. Augustine Smith of Boston Univer-

sity, professor of fine arts in religious education, when he called in his friends and neighbors to help him dedicate his own new home in Wellesley. It was so impressively done, and the plan seemed so full of significance and value, that he was urged to extend it. It was therefore given wide publicity, so that in 1927 at Dr. Smith's suggestion, over half a million Christian people in various countries observed "Home Dedication Day" on the first Sunday in April, the season when so many families move. A young minister in Massachusetts invited the entire town to his redecorated manse for a spiritual house-warming. The same day a young married couple consecrated their simple adobe house in a suburb of Buenos Aires in South America; and twenty homes were dedicated anew in Sendai, in northern Japan. Many recently married couples met with their minister and his gracious wife in a southern California city, for the reconsecration of their lives and homes. In one Pennsylvania county alone, eighty-two out of the eighty-eight churches observed the day. Many noon-day lenten services featured home dedication and radio programs carried the fine sentiment of this new movement to countless listeners-in. It surely has helped to suggest to the Christian world

that our homes need the unifying and sweetening effects of a strong religious purpose and of frank devotion to him who is the spiritual head of every Christian household. Such a well-established custom will probably continue and deserves wide recognition.

From the founder of this movement an appropriate order of service can be obtained, including poems, hymns, readings and prayers, ancient and modern, compiled from various sources. Among these is Rauschenbusch's

LITANY FOR ALL FATHERS AND MOTHERS

"We pray for all Fathers and Mothers, that they may realize the Fatherhood of God, and so practice his Presence that the children may be won for Christ. That they may have the love of parents and the wisdom of teachers. That their lives may be ruled by simplicity, gladness and sympathy. That they may guide by the constraining influence of love, rather than by the restraint of fear. That they may with patience foster in children a love of goodness, truth and beauty; and that they may lead the splendid energy of youth to

find its outlet and satisfaction in fellowship and service, that by the inspiration of thy loving Spirit they may direct the thought of their children, through curiosity to wonder, through fairies to angels, through the imagination of the delights of play-time to the worship of the joys of the Eternal. That all children may acknowledge Christ as their Captain, Hero, King!" [1]

THE SYMBOLISM OF THE HEARTHSTONE

Among the "acts of dedication" suggested is the recognition of the fine symbolism of the hearthstone and the fact that in both ancient and modern homes the open fireplace is the center of the life of the household. Earl Marlatt's recent poem gives a beautiful touch to this idealism:

The Hearth Fire

There's something about a torch-lit fire
That kindles the tinder of lost desire;

That wakes in the rose-gray glow of embers
The flaming April that love remembers;

[1] Rauschenbusch, Walter, *Prayers of the Social Awakening*, The Pilgrim Press.

The summer-haze of toil and trouble,
Becoming an evanescent bubble;

The frost, they too are only seeming.
The fire burns on; it is not dreaming,

But truth that speaks of the fire-lit dome
Of sky and stars as heaven and home.

Oxenham's inscriptions for the cornerstone, the lintel and the fire carry still further the fine symbolism of the new home:

The cornerstone in Truth is laid,
The guardian walls of Honor made,
The roof of Faith is built above
The fire upon the hearth is Love.
Though rains descend and loud winds call,
This happy home shall never fall.

The lintel low enough to keep out pomp and pride:
The threshold high enough to turn deceit aside:
The doorband strong enough from robbers to defend:
This door will open at a touch to welcome every friend.

When the logs are burning free,
Then the fire is full of glee:
When each heart gives out its best,
Then the talk is full of zest:

Light your fire and never fear,
Life was made for love and cheer.[1]

Among the appropriate hymns suggested for such an occasion is this simple one, to be quietly read, or sung to the tune, "Whittier":

O Thou whose gracious presence blest
The home at Bethany,
This shelter from the world's unrest,
This home made ready for its Guest,
We dedicate to Thee.

We build an altar here, and pray
That Thou wilt show thy face.
Dear Lord, if Thou wilt come to stay,
This home we consecrate today
Will be a holy place.

And for the dedication of the *windows*, accompanied by the lighting of candles on the window-sill, the following anonymous poem is suggested, preceded by this petition:

"O God, search our hearts with the light of thy care. Help us to be lights along the pathways of life, to friend and foe alike. May our purity be as the rays of the mountain sunrise, our character as the beacon light at the harbor entrance, and our love and friendship as the glow of the friendly

[1] From "The Fiery Cross" by John Oxenham. Published by Doubleday, Doran & Company, Garden City, N. Y.

fireside. Our energy, power and light we now dedicate to the Master-Builder of mankind. Amen."

The windows of the place wherein I dwell
I will make beautiful. No garish light
Shall enter crudely; but with colors bright
And warm and throbbing I will weave a spell,
In rainbow harmony the theme to tell
Of sage and simple saint and noble knight,
Beggar and king who fought the gallant fight.

These will transfigure even my poor cell.
But when the shadows of the night begin,
And sifted sunlight falls no more on me,
May I have learned to light my lamp within;
So that the passing world may see
Still the same radiance, though with paler hue,
Of the sweet lives that help men to live true.

It is suggested that all the guests present assist in the dedication of the new home by repeating together, as their united prayer, the following simple and beautiful

House Blessing

Bless the four corners of this house,
And be the lintel blest;
And bless the hearth and bless the board
And bless each place of rest;

And bless the door that opens wide
To stranger as to kin;
And bless each crystal window-pane
That lets the sunlight in;
And bless the roof-tree overhead
And every sturdy wall.
The peace of man, the peace of God,
The peace of love on all.[1]

THE UNVEILING OF NEW PICTURES

Recognizing the subtle influence, upon the spirit of the household, of the pictures that hang upon the walls, Professor Smith suggests the careful selection of new pictures for such an occasion and their unveiling as a part of the dedication service. Among the pictures suggested are these favorites:

"Home-Keeping Hearts are Happiest," by W. L. Taylor.
"Lincoln at Gettysburg," by Violet Oakley.
"Penn's Vision," by Violet Oakley.
"The Graduate," by Edwin H. Blashfield.
"Christ at Emmaus," by Leon L'Hermitte.
"The Oath of Knighthood," by Edwin A. Abbey.
"The Artist's Mother," by Whistler.
"All Things Wise and Wonderful," by Tarrant.
"The Gates of Fairyland," by Tarrant.
"Reading from Homer," by Alma-Tadema.

[1] Guiterman, Arthur, *The Laughing Muse,* Harper & Brothers.

"Alma Mater and Her Daughter," by French.
"Dance of the Nymphs," by Corot.
"Appeal to the Great Spirit," by Dallin.
"Boyhood of Sir Walter Raleigh," by Millais.
"The Sun Vow," by Major.

The psychological effect upon the children of a carefully selected picture, hanging for years on the wall as a part of the setting of the quiet drama of an unfolding life, is something beyond all measurements, but we know it is subtle and profound. Well might a family signalize its annual rededication by the adoption of a new picture as a fresh focus of artistic interest and stimulus of imagination and the love of beauty.

A RECENT OBERLIN HOME DEDICATION

In these days when even adolescence seems to dislike any expression of feeling (in public!) and is apt to greet anything romantic with a contemptuous "applesauce!" it is not always easy to secure the whole-hearted support of the family for such a home dedication as we have been describing. It is well to measure carefully in advance the amount of sentiment that such an occasion could safely appeal to, without an unhappy recoil from

the more prosaic. In many homes it would leave a better impression if such an act of dedication were kept quite informal and in fact introduced with complete naturalness and no previous announcement.

This is exactly what was done at a simple neighborly housewarming in which the author shared in Oberlin at the new home of a young colleague. The entire company was most congenial and on terms of intimate friendship. The dinner had been delightful. Every detail of the immaculate new house had been inspected and approved with hearty congratulations. Then the modest host, without any stage directions or preliminaries but with simple naturalness, stepped before the open fire, and as the conversation quieted, said he had found an interesting paragraph in the old, neglected book of Ecclesiasticus in the Apocrypha, on

THE BLESSING OF A HOUSE OF ONE'S OWN

"The chief thing for life is water, and bread, and a garment, and a house to cover shame. Better is the life of a poor man under a shelter of logs, than sumptuous fare in another man's house. With little or with much, be well satisfied. It is a miserable life to go from house to house;

and where thou art a sojourner thou shalt not dare to open thy mouth . . . etc."

Then with a deepening spirit of earnestness he read a suggestive little poem whose delicate imagery led us to think of the ideal home as a refuge from the storms of life, a safe haven where faith offers unfailing protection, and peace turns every commonplace corner into a holy shrine; while laughter and good fellowship prevail within the enfolding walls, whose most significant service to the home is to keep hate without and love within.

That brought us all to the point of realizing the true meaning of this lovely little new house to our gracious host and hostess, the first home they had ever really owned. It was to them a holy place. They had occupied several other houses and apartments, but this home of their own was not a mere domicile. It was the child of their dreams, the result of years of planning, hoping, saving, until architect and contractor produced the reality and made the dream come true. Then loving hands guided by a gentlewoman's taste had cast over it all the spell of human living and loving.

Our host then closed with this simple prayer of consecration: "O Thou, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole

family in heaven and earth is named, in whose eyes all homes and families are precious, as citadels in the growing domain of thy coming Kingdom of Love, we dedicate and consecrate to Thee this hearth and this home, to be thy dwelling-place. Within its walls, sheltered from the stormy winds of dissension and ill will, may only kindly and generous thoughts be fostered. May friends and neighbors, and the stranger within our gates, find here unfailing good cheer and hospitality. And may the Spirit of Christ go with us and with them, in all our going out and our coming in, from this time forth and even for evermore. Amen."

We went to our homes with the very definite feeling that if the fine idealism of that simple, natural service of dedication could be made the pervading spirit and controlling purpose of the average home in America, it would reduce to an astonishing minimum the unhappy clashing of wills, the grievously selfish ignoring of each other's rights, and the serious problems of incompatibility that complicate and ultimately wreck so much of our family life in this hectic generation. Religion is the finest kind of insurance against such lamentable accidents; and the first premium payment may

be beautifully made in a simple home-dedication service. It is one of the rare occasions in life when an ounce of sentiment may save a ton of sorrow.

Chapter XVI

Some Religious Problems of Parents

It has become increasingly evident to many thinking people that the only hope of saving the family as a human institution is in religion. That has always been the great stabilizing force for the family, and it contains the same vital power as ever for the conservation of the family today. When it has come to pass that the best the non-religious sociologists have to propose, to solve the problem, is companionate marriage, it almost makes us believe that social science, unaided by religion, is spiritually bankrupt.

Experiment as they may, they will have to come back to religion for any ultimate solution of the problem, for it is deeper than economics or any purely legal or social considerations. Its sad tangles are deeply involved in the moral issues of character, the ethical basis of living and the spiritual relationships and eternal values which are the

unique province of religion. Unless religion can help the other social sciences to stabilize and conserve the human family, this harassing problem will never be solved.

There is broad basis for optimism in the fact that in spite of all our modern complications, millions of homes are reasonably happy and successful. They are not interested in divorce or companionate marriage, and need no family rehabilitation, for their marriage is no failure. Not all such homes are religious, but a clear majority of them are, without any possible question. Our optimism would be leading us astray, however, if we concluded that the stability of even religious families in these hectic days is not often endangered. We have spoken of religion as the best possible insurance against broken homes, and this is undeniable. But we hasten to add that the effectiveness of this insurance depends very definitely upon the quality of the home religion. It must be genuine religion, not a mere social veneer. And in families of the modern or ultra-modern type, it must be a religion adapted to the modern needs, able to meet every challenge of science and philosophy.

SOME SEARCHING TESTS OF HOME RELIGION

In the progressive group of suburban parents referred to in our opening chapter, there was a general feeling that religion must somehow be able to stabilize the family and solve the most serious of our modern home problems; but that in many cases their own religion was not proving equal to the task. They were frank in acknowledging their partial failure for this reason, and were earnest in the quest for some solution. The neighborhood is a most beautiful one, highly favored and prosperous, with elegant, beautifully equipped homes, ideal schools and churches and all the complex social tangle of ultra-modern life. All this brings a challenge to religion that is by no means simple, and these alert parents were quite aware of it.

Their earnestness of purpose was revealed by their willingness to face and discuss with utmost frankness such questions as the following: What difference does our religion really make, to our homes and our children? What sort of religious influence are we exerting upon our children? Do they respect our religion? Do they believe it is a real thing? Or is our religion just a family

heirloom? Do the children think of it as something out-of-style, *passé?* Does our living, and our home life, square with our religious faith and professions? Are we keeping religion in a separate compartment of life, or is all our life shot through with religious feeling, purpose, motive? Is our loyalty to the church so capricious and erratic that the family regard religion as merely an elective, not a necessity? And even more intimately, what is our religion really worth to ourselves? How is our faith really affecting our life, our conduct and character?

MAKING RELIGION WORTH MORE PERSONALLY

These searching tests came to a climax with the ultimate question, Can we ever hope to make our homes religious, until our personal religion is more genuine, more intelligent and more vital? They were frank to admit, many of them, that their religion was a hazy, nebulous experience which failed to be the power in their home life that it should, because it was so vague. It meant very little that was definite and sure. Its ideas were not clear. Its home teaching was indefinite and weak, so its moral influence was rather feeble. In

fact, the source of the trouble was this: Their religion was too largely a matter of tradition and inheritance from the past. All too little had they tried it out for themselves and made sure of its reality and value.

In seeking the inner reason for this hazy sense of unreality, they finally agreed that the trouble was, God seemed too unreal and far away, either taken too much for granted or else with silent, subtle doubts which they were dodging. They concluded that religion, to be helpful at all, *must have some vital contact with God*, that it must be *a vivifying relationship maintained with a Supreme Power*. So they set about the great quest afresh, the search for the God-in-life who gives all life its power and waits unobtrusively in the shadow for human hearts to find him. Quieting the confusing voices, too many, too near and too loud, they heard again the majestic message of the ages: "The everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary; there is no searching of his understanding. He giveth power to the faint; and to him that hath no might he increaseth strength. Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall: but they that wait for Jehovah shall

renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint." [1]

BRINGING RELIGION UP-TO-DATE

Antiquity is a source of strength in religion; but to be *antiquated* is a sign of weakness. If men and human social life were as unchanging as God, religion need never change. But just because each generation, among progressive people, is different from the last, religion, like everything vital, must grow also, or it no longer fits the needs of men. The reason many of our contemporaries have lost interest in religion, and it has lost its real grip on their lives, is because such as they have is a mid-Victorian religion, an exact pattern of their grandfather's faith, and it fits them no better than his old wedding coat. It is strangely true that men who are up to the minute in their own specialty in business or profession are a century or two behind sometimes in their religious thinking. They imagine religion has been static, all these years, while science in all its branches has so notably advanced. Is it reasonable that everything else in

[1] Isaiah 40:28-31.

the range of human knowledge and experience should change and develop, but religion remain unchanged?

We discovered that some of our suburban friends, in the group referred to above, were suffering this handicap. They were successful men and women and, in their own special lines of work, thoroughly modern, but religion they had simply taken for granted as something that was as stationary as real estate. Religious retainers, they paid their minister to do their thinking for them. They had few religious ideas of their own of which they were sure. Then when their children, in high-school science courses, came to them with questions about evolution, they were perfectly helpless. Arguing from their inherited, traditional viewpoint of religion, they could not meet the sharper modern weapons of their own children.

More common in this particular group in a liberal church were the people who were stranded between the old views and the new, but were distinctly not conservative. A 1928 model they considered *de rigeur*, in everything from automobiles to hair-cuts. Ultra modern in many things, they wished to be up-to-date also in religion, but were

making little personal effort to accomplish it. They had lost their grandparents' assurance of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and the certainties of the old-time faith, but had few positive convictions to take its place. They were rather sure that Baalam's ass never spoke, that Jonah's whale was a myth, and that the sun and moon never stood still in the valley of Aijalon or anywhere else. They could not believe that God used vocal cords to speak to Moses, but had not made the discovery that he has spoken to many human hearts since then, people whose spiritual senses were alive to his presence and his message.

College graduates or not, it is vital for such people to think their way through to a reasonable and satisfying religious viewpoint which will harmonize with their modern views of life in general. Until they do this, with the help of the best modern writers and reliable counselors, there will be a sad rift between their religion and the rest of their experience that will be likely to prove fatal to their religion. They must unify and harmonize their philosophy of life. They must have an intelligent religion they can themselves respect. Forced to accept the conclusions of modern science,

it is fatal to their religion unless they can discover that there is no necessary conflict between a modern faith and genuine science, and that the leaders in the field of natural science are religious men, churchmen today.

It will reassure them to discover that the recent investigations of Millikan, Compton and other physicists, in the realm of electrons and protons within the microscopic atom, reveal the fact that the ultimate reality in the material world is not substance or matter at all, but *energy*, which is essentially spirit, thus sounding the death knell of materialism as an outworn theory. Let them read such modern interpretations of religion and life as Streeter's *Reality* and *Adventure* and they will find it possible to be just as intellectually honest in the field of religion as in any other realm of experience, and just as up-to-date. Very many parents have already taken the pains to do this, not only for their own satisfaction, but to be able to challenge successfully the easy, superficial scepticism of their own young folks in the home. It is a great thing thus to be able to rescue the home from the quicksands of a shallow unbelief and to lay solid foundations for genuine religious ex-

perience in new-found convictions which meet our modern needs.

MAKING RELIGION SIMPLER, PRAYER MORE REAL

But the real test of working religion is not merely to achieve an honest faith and arrive at an intellectual resting-place. Rather is it found in reducing religion to its simplest terms and finding the heart of it in prayer. If religion is a life-giving relationship maintained with the Supreme Power, it finds its vital reality in prayer. This would hardly be possible if God were far away. In the old days when God was believed to be transcendent, enthroned far off in a glorious paradise remote from this world, it took a very credulous faith to believe in prayer at all. How could such a God hear prayer?

I have a good deal of sympathy with the honest sceptics of a century ago, before the great advance of modern science explained God's ways of working. But it is easier today to believe in the reasonableness of prayer, for God has been brought near to us, as the vital unity of all the resident forces at the heart of nature, the very soul of life. The gospel of his presence in his world has wonderfully

vitalized religion in the present generation. It interprets religion as the life of God in the hearts of men. It makes prayer simply the channel through which the divine life enters human consciousness and makes that union possible.

Prayer is natural and reasonable because of our natural relationship to our Father God. Both God and men are spirit essentially, sharing and merging in the invisible eternal life. It is "in him we live and move and have our being." Because of this close relationship, he can hear and understand us and we can grow to understand him. Communion becomes possible between us. This relationship is so intimate, it has been described as like that between the tree and the leaf, which gathers sunshine for the tree from which it draws the vital forces which give it life. Again, it is like the bay and the ocean, so vitally connected that twice a day the bay reaches far out to sea with its beseeching ebb tides as in prayer, and in response the mighty flood tides of the ocean flow back upon the bay, restoring its life, filling all its pools and channels and lifting it to higher levels.

Thus prayer is the real interflow of power from our Father God in response to our human cry of need. "God does not hear prayer—he *feels* it,"

suggests Dr. Palmer. "The yearnings of our souls reach directly into the life of God. The connection between our lives and his is as real and immediate as that between two wireless stations tuned to receive each other's wireless messages." [1] To those of us who feel his unobtrusive Presence as the one constant fact in life, prayer is no long-distance telephoning to a foreigner in another world, but simple, friendly conversation with the nearest and most intimate of friends. It is simply being on speaking terms with God.

It is very illuminating to see what prayer meant to Jesus Christ. He had a great heart and poured out his sympathy unstintedly. He had a way of putting something of himself into every person he healed or helped. Such life-sharing, self-giving always costs. It cost Jesus both physical vitality and spiritual energy, and when night came he was more than physically tired; he was nervously depleted and spiritually over-taxed. His reservoir of energy needed recharging from the source of psychic vitality. So very naturally he prayed; long nights sometimes. Next day he was a remarkably changed person. He had renewed his

[1] Palmer, A. W., *The Drift Toward Religion*, p. 29. The Pilgrim Press.

mental vitality, had regained poise, elasticity, spiritual insight and power. The self-renewing processes of prayer had revitalized his will and strengthened his consciousness of God's presence and his conviction of oneness and harmony with him. Thus was restored the wonderful equilibrium and peace of his placid soul. Jesus never could have borne his lonely burdens without this restoring of his personal resources and depleted energies through prayer, as the tides of God's power flowed in upon his soul and gave him victorious life.

This suggests exactly what prayer should be worth to the harassed father or mother in our homes today. It is the channel through which God's unwearied strength and patience can enter our souls and give us power equal to our tasks. It helps us to concentrate and mobilize our psychic forces. As Coe says: "It begets the confidence that tends toward victory over difficulties. It produces in a distracted mind the repose that is power. It freshens a mind deadened by routine." In all of us there are stored energies repressed by the commonplace life that must somehow be released to make our personalities more effective. These energies can be released through prayer. It is thus

prayer makes us super-men, growing men, men plus the power of God. Herein is the real dynamic of religious living, and it comes in the simplest possible way, just the practice of friendship with God. This was the simple religion of Jesus himself, just friendship raised to the *n*th power. Is there anything our homes need more than this?

HOME TRAINING IN THE ART OF WORSHIP

If art is "the use of means to accomplish a purpose," there is no higher art than worship, for it deals with the highest values and its goal is better living. Certainly there is no phase of religious education more important than this matter of training in the art of worship. Many churches demonstrate the art of worship rather badly, partly because their church schools teach it in a careless manner. Only recently, in most churches, have we begun to realize the importance of actual training in worship for our children and young folks in the church school, that they may gain the spirit of reverence, learn the naturalness of prayer, appreciate the beautiful religious appeal of sacred music and art, and find the way, through practice, to express and thereby deepen their religious feel-

ings. Professor Smith of Yale refers to worship as "an incomparable act which more than any other brings one into the presence of the Unseen Spirit, lifts every experience and problem to a higher plane of thought, serves as a rallying-point for one's scattered and defeated energies, and unites all who participate by a bond which is social and spiritual." [1]

Though the technic of this noble art of worship can best be taught in the church school with groups of children, the spirit of it and the naturalness of it are best learned at home and in earliest childhood. The holiest tradition of all our Christian homes is the commonest custom of implanting the habits of bedside prayer so early the child probably will forget its origin. Not so common now is the custom of family worship, in these hurried days when some one says "it is difficult to get an American family together long enough to say the Lord's Prayer." Yet, as Dr. Smith says, "Home worship as a builder of family spirit and morale can hardly be over-estimated," and unfortunate is the home where this custom is no longer honored. When the sad days come, as ultimately they must, when the home circle is broken, the family is for-

[1] Smith, R. S., in *Int'l Jour. of Relig. Educ.*, November, 1927.

tunate that can come together with the naturalness of long habit and find strength from God to bear the common sorrow.

The best feature of the daily habit of grace at meals is that it accustoms the children to an attitude of devotion and thankfulness to God as the normal thing in life. It makes religion as natural as any other function of life, and thus takes it out of the realm of the unusual. It gives the family the religious stamp, sets the family ideals as definitely Christian, recognizes God's providence as a constant fact and makes Christ the invisible head of the household. This is home training of the utmost value to the children. It furnishes them with the moral defenses of religious ideals which will always have a strong influence over their consciences in times of temptation wherever they go.

In recent years there has been quite a reaction in favor of a return to this good old custom. Many homes have gone back to it after years of interruption. Some churches have made successful campaigns to increase the number of "family altars" in the parish. *God's Minute* and various other little handbooks have been recently published containing brief forms of prayer suitable at the family table. Simple forms of thanksgiving are some-

times taught the children, to say or sing together or in turn; and in some homes even the Quaker blessing of bowed heads and a moment of silent thankfulness is at times found most effective.

In the average city or suburban home that is hampered by a crowded and a complex family schedule, these simpler forms are often more practicable than the more elaborate custom of morning devotions, and they are always possible, for they take so little time. Not long ago a little child was a guest for the first time in a certain home and bowed her head in quiet reverence, after all were seated at the table, as she supposed was everybody's custom. At the time nothing happened, except an embarrassing moment for the host and hostess. But before that child was a guest again, that family had adopted the beautiful custom which she had so innocently taught them.

PRACTICING RELIGION IN CONDUCT

But the ultimate religious problem is concerned with neither faith nor worship, but with the actual coining of religion in conduct and character. Many have tried to isolate these from religion, or to develop religion without ethics, but it cannot be

successfully done. Religion is *for character*. And the last test of home religion is whether or not the religious spirit and ideals are actually getting into life and conduct. If not, it has failed, even though it succeeds in filling the family pew every Sunday.

In our summary of the necessary functions of the home, in chapter six, we said that the home must at all hazards achieve the formation of at least the fundamentals of character. It must somehow endow its children with the four great moral safeguards of life: *self-control*, *self-respect*, *a sense of honor*, and *the spirit of chivalry*. And the growing children must also acquire the homespun cardinal virtues of *patience*, *sympathy*, *kindness*, *love*, *truthfulness*, *honesty*, *reliability*, *the sense of justice* and *regard for fair play* which are the indispensable elements in the moral spectrum that together form the white light of Christian social living and a civilized culture.

Now these virtues cannot be taught abstractly, as virtues, or by just talking about them, or be adopted as a code of ethics, by passing resolutions. They must be gotten into the brain paths by action, by practice, by habitual exercise. The only way to learn kindness is to be kind. The

only way to become honest and truthful is to be honest and tell the truth. This serious family problem then is to discover *projects* for the children in formative years by which these virtues will be acquired by dint of positive action. Only thus will they get into life. The new conditions of the modern city home unquestionably make this business more difficult than ever in the past. It is far more difficult when there is but one lonely child, for three or four brothers and sisters help develop one another's character by the inevitable social contacts and mutual experience. And apartment life is reduced to such meager simplicity that projects for the children have to be invented by ingenious parents. They seldom come along automatically as they do on the farm. Absolute reliability, for instance, is one of the high tests of human character. In outgrowing childishness, the youth must acquire this virtue, if he would become really manly and mature; and his future business success and social standing as well as his moral character will depend upon it.

Hence the importance of giving a child, with his own consent, a program of regular duties for which he becomes personally responsible, and then holding him to their faithful performance, till

like a soldier he counts one at his post and can be trusted. It is too easy for lazy parents to let such matters slide; but such negligence does the child great harm. And it throws on the school and the church the task of making the child reliable, which often they find too difficult because the home fails to coöperate. One of the reasons for allowing children to have pets in the home is to develop the child's sympathy and kindness and his reliability in the regular care of his dependent friend. But seventh-story pets are even more unwelcome than the children themselves. The serious difficulty of practicing children in conduct projects is one of the great reasons for quitting the city for the suburb or the country home.

THE PROBLEM OF MAKING LIFE BEAUTIFUL

This discussion of religious problems of parents might be much further extended, but the chapter is getting unduly long. A single further topic must at least be suggested. In this hectic age that is struggling for freedom and release, we are faced with the necessity for new motives, new reasons for rightness, new grounds for character, new appeals to youthful consciences that will make old

ideals still conquer. The appeal to authority and tradition is passing by the board. The appeal to the Bible has far less weight. Even the will of God has little influence sometimes in the court of modern youth. But *beauty* still reigns there. The inherent love for the beautiful may still be appealed to successfully. The ugly is still abhorrent. It behooves us, then, to develop in our children this esthetic sense, for real taste has its positive moral values and may prove in the future a greater moral safeguard than we dream. Does anyone think this is not a religious problem? Surely God is the incarnation not only of perfect truth and goodness, but of perfect beauty; and through the avenue of the beautiful do we find him, fully as often as along the line of any other quest.

Only recently has the function of imagination in religion been fully appreciated. It has more to do with the real than with the unreal, which we used to think was its entire domain. It tests all reality for us. It is imagination which gives the feel of the real to truth. We call imagination to our aid when we wish to make any possible experience seem real. A good, true-to-life story stimulates this function. A lovely picture helps us to

see far more than the picture. All genuine art feeds the growing mind and helps the child to know what is real and right as well as what is beautiful. It interprets life and vastly enriches it. It helps to open the windows of life. It liberates the mind to enjoy the noble and the beautiful. It makes horizons more distant, gives largeness and vision and increases one's capacity for living and for service.

Well may we warn our youth, "Keep thine imagination with all diligence, for out of it come the consequences of life." Let them develop a love, even a reverence, for beauty, under the spur of a keen, vivid, trained imagination, and they will have a great safeguard against temptations that degrade and debase. It will keep life in true perspective and will greatly help them to discover its eternal values and the power of sheer goodness. Miss Clinton's recent poem, "Which?" reminds us of the infinite chasm which separates, in every phase of living experience, the blind from those who really can see.

WHICH?

Flowers,—and a riot of color,—
Or a sightless world.

Sea-foam clouds and a sailing moon, dream ships,—
Or just—clouds and moon.
Flaming sunsets—creeping shadows,
Golden stars on the breast of heaven,—
Or night.
Trees heavy with snow—boughs white on top,
Black underneath,—glistening diamonds!
Or just—winter.
Raindrops moistening the thirsty tongues of budding greenery,—
Or rain.
Fingers of ecstasy playing on heart strings,—
Or—words and a tune.
Joy gained through sorrow, understanding through pain,—
Or just (God help us!)—Sorrow and pain.
Fulfillment! Love triumphant! Life everlasting!
Or—death—the end. Which?

—*Inez F. Clinton*

Chapter XVII

Is There a Modern Family Bible?

This was not included in our discussion of other religious problems of parents, in the preceding chapter, because it deserves a chapter by itself. The family Bible is by no means extinct. In the states of the so-called "Bible belt," where conservatism reigns unchallenged, it is doubtless still used to record the births, marriages and deaths, which some of those states do not trouble to record officially. It is very likely still used not only for family devotions, but also to settle important questions such as whether "to turn or to dye," whether to plant wheat or barley, corn or tobacco, whether to pick cotton today or tomorrow—by the magic method of chance texts.

But among more intelligent people, the fact that biblical scholarship has made progress and has brought a new scale of values, making certain parts of the Old Testament live as never before,

especially the social teachings of the prophets, while other portions are found to be less valuable, constitutes in itself a problem for parents. The dead-level Bible is gone. It takes brains and study to find the living values of the new interpretation, and many busy people are bewildered by it. It is a sad fact that very many modern homes have no family Bible, that is, no book of life, of living inspirations, at the heart of the home, because they have lost irrevocably the old Bible but have not found the new.

JUST HOW IS THE BIBLE INSPIRED?

Yet there is a modern family Bible, which fits our home needs today. Of course the educated family can not accept the outworn theory of verbal inspiration, which the Bible never claims for itself. The famous "sand-bag battery" at the battle of Inkerman was a useless position when finally captured. For hours the battle had raged about it with terrific bloodshed. Literally thousands fell. But it was not at all the key position its assailants had imagined. It proved both untenable and practically useless. Exactly so with the old theory of verbal inspiration. It was a Reformation

theory, by which an infallible book replaced an infallible papacy—the authority of both based, unfortunately, on the fallible words of very human men. The idea that the *words* of the Bible were inspired, essentially dictated by the Spirit of God (like the Koran and the Book of Mormon!), is the dangerous theory which has divided Protestantism into nearly two hundred warring sects. It has done far more harm than good. It is time it was recognized as not a key position at all, but another sand-bag battery, dangerous, untenable and useless.

Yet Christians well know that their Bible is truly inspired. Not the mere words, but the life messages, not the book, but the lives back of the book. *Living men* are inspired, not printed pages. God's spirit breathes into human hearts and minds, not into goose-quills or printer's ink. We therefore find in the Bible *inspired lives* of men and women in whom the spirit of God entered because they were in harmony with his purposes and anxious to learn and do his will. Most of them were seers or prophets. Compared with the puppet kings and the priests who were usually their pawns, the prophets were men of majestic personality and noble character. Appearing suddenly, at uncer-

tain intervals, but whenever a national crisis demanded them, these inspired prophets were a remarkable dynasty of spiritual leaders. They and their messages are the beating heart of the Old Testament and its highest inspiration. The priests were professionally pious, but the prophets were personally, vitally religious, with a vivid sense of God and duty. For instance, the book of Isaiah is one of the best in the Bible. It is full of inspirational passages, uttered at white heat by a man afire with the sense of God in his life. God was the most real of persons to the prophet Isaiah, and he found his will to be righteousness and justice among men. Isaiah learned this when he felt the invisible Presence of Jehovah while worshiping one day in the Temple; and he became the power behind the throne in the reign of five kings.

Quite differently another of the prophets, Amos the herdsman of Tekoa, discovered the sublime holiness of God out under the stars alone in the wilderness. In the town, he saw the wickedness of the people, the injustice of the king and the hypocrisy of the priests. This startling contrast between God and men taught the prophet his duty. It was his responsibility to speak for God, voicing the great message with which God had burdened

his soul. So this brave herdsman burst in upon the smug complacency of the nobles and priests at the court of Jeroboam II at Bethel and aroused first a smile and then their wrath. His torrential eloquence swept away all opposition till he had delivered his message. God had made his message clear to him, and he gave voice to it with terrific emphasis. The woes he pronounced upon princes, priests and people that day for their sins must have blanched their faces and made them tremble. The angry priests drove him speedily from the city and he was lucky to escape with his life. But he had unburdened his soul and went back to his home in the wilderness with the satisfaction of having done his duty.

This ancient story, some twenty-eight centuries old, an undoubtedly true story of the struggle and holy passion of a faithful human life, shows us clearly what is meant by inspiration. God's divine spirit somehow touched this man Amos' life. He put into his heart the sacred fire of a great mission and a great message, and it burned within him till he uttered it. No one knows whether his faithful preaching brought to repentance anyone who heard the living voice; but many later prophets of righteousness have been inspired by Amos' ex-

ample through the centuries since and have brought the same challenge of social justice and genuine religion to myriads of men. We know his life must have been inspired and that God must have been back of his words, for we feel the inspiration of his burning message for our own generation and our own hearts.

So we see the prophet was not simply a necromancer who foretold the future, but a man who spoke forth boldly for God. His New Testament counterpart was the apostle, a man sent forth with an inspired message of the gospel for the needy world. The real inspiration of both prophets and apostles was first in their noble, heroic lives, afire with God, and secondly in their burning messages for their own generation. Later in the providence of God, these messages were preserved for us in the written and printed word, and have continued to inspire and arouse and bless the world.

SOME POPULAR FALLACIES ABOUT THE BIBLE

Besides the old theories of literal revelation, plenary inspiration and equal authority of all parts of the Bible, and the supposition that the chief function of the prophets was to foretell in some

magical way events beyond their ken, there are many other popular fallacies that have gathered about the Bible in the passing of the years. Probably the uneducated still forget that it has not always been English, but has been repeatedly translated and revised, and for centuries, before the age of printing, was preserved in manuscripts, which were copied by painstaking scribes who occasionally made errors, because they were human. Dr. Bickersteth quotes an American deacon's objection to the revised version, "The old version was good enough for St. Paul and it's good enough for me."

Even the punctuation marks have been supposed to be inspired, and of course the dates in the margins! Those badly-mixed dates have confused many people. There is reason to believe that even so good a man as Mr. Bryan, and so lacking in biblical scholarship, never knew till a few days before his death that the Old Testament chronology printed in our King James version was invented by Archbishop Ussher of England in 1701. That is why all Bibles printed prior to that date do not contain any of it. Even so recent a translation as our Authorized Version had been in use for nearly a century before people were taught by

these false dates in the margins that the world was created as late as 4004 B.C.!

The chapters and verses are also supposed to be original, though as a matter of fact they are comparatively modern. The division into chapters was made by Cardinal Hugo, in the Latin version in 1250 A.D., to help in the use of his concordance. The Old Testament verse divisions were made by Jewish scholars in the ninth century, but the New Testament was not divided into verses until 1551, when a printer, Robert Stephens, did it hastily and rather poorly, on a tedious horseback ride from Paris to Lyons!

The fact that the printed Bible is bound as a single book makes many people forget that it is really not a book, but a whole library. The selection of the "canon"—that is, determining what books should or should not go into the Bible, is a holy mystery to the great majority, though it was not settled by the Catholics until the Council of Trent in 1546, and Protestants never agreed on it at all. Luther claimed Esther, Ecclesiastes and the epistle of James should be left out of the Bible; Calvin left out 2 Peter, and Zwingli the book of Revelation; while many put in books that are now no longer used, such as the epistle of

Barnabas, which is included in the Codex Sinaiticus, possibly the oldest Greek manuscript of the Bible now existing. Furthermore, many apocryphal books are still officially included in the Bible of the English Church that are no longer used in the Protestant churches of America. For this reason King Edward VII felt obliged to return the magnificent Bible sent him by the American Bible Society as a coronation day present! It left out the Apocrypha.

It is also popularly supposed that each book of the Bible is the work of a single writer and his original composition throughout. We find, however, no less than a dozen lost books, back of the Bible, from which the Old Testament writers quoted by name, such as the book of Jasher (evidently a book of very ancient poetry), the book of Nathan the Seer and the book of the Wars of Jehovah.[1] Much ancient lore existed in written form long before the early biblical writings, from which the writers quoted or which they greatly improved upon for instance, the stories of the creation and the flood. The present writer has seen in the British Museum ancient books in the form

[1] See Joshua 10:13; II Chron. 9:29, 12:15, 20:34; Numbers 21:14; I Kings 11:41; etc.

of clay tablets, dug up in the ruins of ancient Nineveh, that contain interesting versions of both the flood and the creation stories. These are at least five centuries older than the original writing of Genesis, though the Genesis accounts are much finer and more spiritual, but obviously based on the older stories.

It is well for these misconceptions to be corrected, so that people may know that our Bible has been preserved in its present form, not because of any magical origin, for it is a part of human history and has come down to us through human hands; but *because it deserved to survive*, for its inherent values, its literary beauty and its spiritual power.

THE GREAT GAINS OF THE MODERN BIBLE

There are great advantages in this natural and historical interpretation of the Scriptures, that we may rightly call the modern Bible. The new viewpoint corrects many distortions and is actually saving the Bible for educated people who would otherwise have to discard it. For instance, the ethics of the Old Testament no longer have to be defended, when it is understood that the Bible

is a record of the progressive revelation of God to men and a history of the growth of religion from crude early forms up to its full purity and authority in Jesus Christ. In the crude days of the patriarchs, slavery and polygamy and even human sacrifice were thought to be right; but we no longer have to defend the Old Testament for that. Such evils were never the will of God. Primitive men in those cruder days simply misunderstood him. We do not have to apologize for Jacob's knavishness, Abraham's lies, Solomon's gross polygamy or David's murderous adultery, for none of them was a saint and the times were very primitive. Jesus himself frankly criticizes the Old Testament, in Matthew 5:21-48, on five counts. For instance, the Old Testament says you should hate your enemy (Lev. 19:18). Jesus shows that this was bad ethics of primitive days.

Relief from the theory of verbal inspiration makes impossible now such slavery to the letter of Scripture as has proved so tragic in the past. We should remember that the reason a hundred thousand poor unfortunate women were burned as "witches" in Europe in the seventeenth century, and seventeen hanged even in Puritan New England, was because of the literal obedience to the

ancient Hebrew law in Exodus 22:18, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." We are not troubled now by the minor contradictions and slight differences which occasionally are found between different biblical writers. The four gospel writers do not need to agree in minor details. They were different men, with an interesting difference in viewpoint. Perfect agreement would have been so unnatural, it would have made their testimony less credible and valuable.

Likewise the omission of certain passages in the American Standard revision, like the account of the angel troubling the water in the pool of Bethesda (John 5:4) and the famous reference to the Trinity in I John 5:7 causes modern readers no trouble whatever. We have discovered the honest revisers left them out of our modern Bible because they are not found in the ancient manuscripts which have been discovered since 1611, proving that these passages were not in the original writings. In fact, the Trinity passage in the epistle of John was an invention of the fifteenth century! For no Greek manuscript before that time contains it. But these items make no difference whatever to modern readers who do not worship the letter of Scripture but reverence its spirit

and its essential message of life. In spite of them all, it is clear that the Scriptures contain reliable testimony from inspired men of old that they personally found God, and learned his message for their lives and for the world. In the Bible we not only find God, but also his wonderful method with men. We gain the inspiration and vision to find him here in our own age. And supremely we find there the Christ. This alone would be enough to make the Bible priceless, the incomparable book of the centuries. Some people lose the glory of the forest for the trees. Don't let the mere words lose for you the lasting value of the Bible.

TRACING THE BIBLE'S PEDIGREE

Much of the popular unbelief in the Bible is due to the fact that most of us know nothing of its pedigree. We have discovered it did not drop from heaven like the Koran, but how it ever got here we do not know. It is an eye-opener to many to trace back our modern American version, through the English revision of 1881, the Authorized version of 1611, the Douay (Catholic) Bible of 1600, the Bishop's Bible of 1568, the Geneva Bible of 1560, the Great Bible of 1539, and Cov-

erdale's translation of 1536, back to Tyndale's New Testament of 1525, the first one printed in English. It is fine to see these on the table together, to compare them and to discover the progress the English Bible has made through the generations. And then to go back to Gutenberg's Latin Bible of 1454, the first printed Bible in any language, and to Wiclif's great manuscript translation in the primitive English of 1382, over a hundred precious copies of which still remain; and from Erasmus' improved Greek Bible of 1516 back to the oldest Greek manuscripts and the ancient Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome that has been the Catholic Bible ever since 385.

It is a marvelous romance to discover the way the written Bible was preserved in parchment manuscripts for fourteen centuries until permanently rescued by the printing press and finally made available for every home. Over 3,800 of these priceless Greek manuscripts are still in existence, most of them in libraries or the original monasteries where they were copied, far back in the middle ages or earlier.

Old Testament manuscripts in the original Hebrew do not go back earlier than the tenth century (The Petrograd Codex of the Prophets, 916

A.D.), which partly accounts for the fact that our text of the earlier Testament is less accurate. But the Greek New Testament's pedigree we can trace back unbroken to the most valuable three books in the world, that money could not buy, the Alexandrian manuscript in the British Museum, the Vatican manuscript in the Vatican Library at Rome and the Sinaiticus at Petrograd, all in beautiful condition, and two of them dating from the early fourth century. The last of these was found in the old monastery on Mt. Sinai in 1844. The first was sent to England by the patriarch of Constantinople as a royal present to King Charles I, in 1628, just seventeen years too late to help make the King James version a more accurate translation.

There are two good reasons why we have no manuscripts of the New Testament dating earlier than the time of the Emperor Constantine. Before that time the Christians were suffering persecution and their holy books were in great danger of being burned; and many books in those days, especially those of the poorer people, were merely rolls of papyrus, perishable paper made of rushes. Naturally when the Christians of the fourth century were able to afford the parchment Bibles, they

cared less for the poor papyrus rolls which were so fragile.

It helps us, however, to bridge this gap in the Bible's pedigree to study the papyrus fragments of the teachings of Jesus, that have been recently discovered, buried in the dry sands in the Nile Valley. They were found by English scholars in 1897 and 1903 and go back possibly to the end of the first century.[1] They contain some familiar sayings of Jesus and some interesting new ones, hitherto unpublished, but no narrative material. These papyrus fragments prove that the sayings of Jesus were written down very early by his friends, doubtless by eyewitnesses like Matthew, and were kept in manuscript form. It is good to know that we did not have to depend on mere oral tradition and fickle human memories, but that Christ's teachings have come down to us in written form, probably from the men who heard his voice.

Only biblical scholars know of the infinite amount of pains, of time and hard study, that has been put into the scientific investigation and comparison of these three or four thousand manuscripts, precious relics of the dead past, in order to work out the most accurate Greek text possible

[1] Grenfell and Hunt, *Sayings of Our Lord.* Henry Frowde.

from which our modern American version is translated. We may be confident that we have substantially the true messages of Jesus, on which the Christian religion bases its spiritual authority as a redemptive religion for the winning of a better world.

THE GREATEST OF ALL "BEST SELLERS"

No book has ever been able to match one-tenth of the popularity of the Bible. It is always the world's best seller. Most books sell less than 2,000 copies. A very few reach 1,000,000. Probably over 40,000,000 Bibles and Testaments are now being sold every year. The American Bible Society alone distributed nearly 10,000,000 last year. And in spite of the great antiquity of the book, these figures have doubled in the last ten years! Every year more people are buying the Bible. It cannot be a decadent, outworn book! The Bible is now being published in 770 languages and dialects, and lately it has been appearing in some new dialect every six weeks. The British Bible Society has in the past century published more than 300,000,000 Bibles and the American Society more than half as many. Over 3,000,

000 copies are going annually to China alone, with a large increase every year.

The Bible is now translated and read in all languages and nearly all known dialects from Albanian to Yiddish, Zapotec and Zulu. In a great many of these the missionaries themselves had to reduce the language to writing, and really made the written language by their Bible translation. The Bible is also printed in six systems of embossed type for the blind. Some Eastern peoples have a superstition about printed pages and will not read anything in type. It must be written or they will not read it. So the Bible has been written by hand in their language and then photographed page by page and the facsimile pages printed in large quantities for these fastidious readers! No obstacle can prevent the Bible's making its victorious way through the medium of every human language to every race and tribe in all the world and ultimately to every family. Unfortunately, not all who own Bibles read them, but many millions make this deathless book their daily guide. As a literary phenomenon it stands in a class by itself. It is still very obviously on the crest of the wave of popularity in the markets of the world. Is it holding its own in the homes

of the educated? Is there a modern family Bible for the truly modern family? We believe there is, but it will be a Bible interpreted somewhat along the lines of our discussion of the natural evolution of the writings of Scripture as a part of human history, a normal record of the religious aspirations and struggles of the Hebrew people.

A RELIGIOUS SOURCE BOOK FOR THE MODERN FAMILY

The facts we have mentioned in this chapter regarding the human elements in the Bible have been quoted in no spirit of criticism of the Bible or any desire to exploit its unimportant divergencies, but in the firm belief that the desire of some to conceal the truth about the Bible is hurting the Bible today. The day is past when religion thrives on ignorance. We are rapidly becoming a nation of high-school graduates, and with many millions of college bred. Intelligent people require an intelligent family Bible. They must have a religious source book about which they are not afraid to ask questions, and whose spiritual authority depends not upon tradition or any theory of its verbal inspiration, but upon its actually inspiring

quality and its successful appeal to human hearts. Our homes still need the Bible, for beyond all other literature there is life in the book, and we may find God in the book.

"The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" is very true of the Bible's effect upon modern critical families. If they read it slavishly, literally, with no attempt to find the historical interpretation; if they assume that all parts of it are of the same value and importance and they make no discrimination; if they try to make the religion of Jesus carry the load of the Old Testament cruelties and immoralities—they will close the book in confusion and despair. But if they look through the letter of the Scripture and find the spirit of it; if they read with the special writer's purpose and the needs of his age in mind; and if they test it all by the spirit and teaching of Jesus—they will find it a source book of spiritual inspirations without limit. It will have perennial value for them. They will return to it again and again in days of stress, weariness and sorrow, as to the springs of life and the deep sources of power.

No one can deny that the Bible is the clearest fountain of spiritual wisdom that the world has ever known, and a trustworthy record of many of

the highest spiritual achievements of the race. The New Testament gives us a true picture of the Christ in all his matchless beauty of moral perfection and his intimate communion with the Father God, whom he knew as no one else has ever known him. This fact alone would make the Bible unique and indispensable. We agree heartily with Van Dyke, "No other book in the world has had such a strange vitality, such an outgoing power of influence and inspiration. Not only has it brought to the countries in whose heart it has been set, new ideals of civilization, new models of character, new conceptions of virtue and hopes of happiness, but it has also given new impulse and form to the shaping imagination of man and begotten beauty in literature and the other arts. Suppose it were possible to dissolve away all the works of art which clearly owe their being to thoughts, emotions, or visions derived from the Bible—how it would impoverish the world!" [1]

Let us conclude, then, that we all still need this ancient book and our progressive homes need it, possibly all the more because they are modern and need the spiritual clarity of the Bible to offset the

[1] Van Dyke, H., "The Book of Books," in *Companionable Books,* chap. i, p. 5. Charles Scribner's Sons.

mechanistic and materialistic views of life they have gained from their studies. We need the guidance of the God-inspired men of the Bible, that we, too, may become seers and find a vital, spiritual interpretation for our own feverish age. With fine insight Dr. Palmer says, "The great thing which the Bible can do for our religious life is not to present to us an artificially preserved message from God, to which we can go to learn his will. It is rather so to present to us the spectacle of other men in other days hearing his voice and finding help in his presence that we shall be inspired to follow their example and open our lives to the indwelling of his spirit. We also are to be responsive to his still, small voice and go out into our world to find every common bush aflame with God. The supreme value of the Bible is not merely to find God there, but to gain inspiration to find him here. Each age must renew for itself something akin to the experience recorded in the Bible." [1]

[1] Palmer, A. W., *The Drift Toward Religion,* p. 46. The Pilgrim Press.

Chapter XVIII

Grading the Bible for Children and Youth

It seems strange to go back to an Oriental land and a distant age to find our greatest source-book for religious inspirations. Yet it was no accident or mere coincidence that the greatest and purest three religions which have ever won the loyalty of men found their origin in those Near East deserts and bleak mountains where dwelt Moses, Jesus and Mohammed, many centuries but not many miles apart. There was something in that ancient land of mystery and calm that brought God strangely near and quelled the strident human clamor so that discerning men could hear his messages.

Perhaps the very simplicity and poverty of life aided the seer to concentrate the powers of his soul on the Father Invisible. Perhaps our growing dependence upon civilized comforts, our slavery to material things that are now "in the saddle and

ride mankind," the sheer complexity and intricacy of this rushing tangle called civilization, may have so stunted spiritual genius that we must reverence the men of old as spiritual guides because we cannot rival them. At all events, the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, though they have inspired the world's best literature, art and noble living for nineteen centuries, still remain peerless and unrivaled claimants to our loyalty today. To them we must go, and always shall, for our supreme source of religious inspirations. Perhaps no one has more nobly recognized this fact than Van Dyke in this eloquent passage following:

UNRIVALLED SOURCE-BOOK FOR THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT

> "Born in the East and clothed in Oriental form and imagery, the Bible walks the ways of all the world with familiar feet and enters land after land to find its own everywhere. It has learned to speak in hundreds of languages to the heart of man. It comes into the palace to tell the monarch that he is a servant of the Most High, and into the cottage to assure the peasant that he is a son of God.

Children listen to its stories with wonder and delight, and wise men ponder them as parables of life. It has a word of peace for the time of peril, a word of comfort for the day of calamity, a word of light for the hour of darkness. Its oracles are repeated in the assembly of the people, and its counsels whispered in the ear of the lonely. The wicked and the proud tremble at its warning, but to the wounded and the penitent it has a mother's voice. The wilderness and the solitary place have been made glad by it, and the fire on the hearth has lit the reading of its well-worn page. It has woven itself into our deepest affections and colored our dearest dreams; so that love and friendship, sympathy and devotion, memory and hope, put on the beautiful garments of its treasured speech, breathing of frankincense and myrrh.

"Above the cradle and beside the grave its great words come to us uncalled. They fill our prayers with power larger than we know, and the beauty of them lingers on our ear long after the sermons which they adorned have been forgotten. They return to us swiftly and quietly, like doves flying from far away.

They surprise us with new meanings, like springs of water breaking forth from the mountain beside a long-trodden path. They grow richer as pearls do when they are worn near the heart.

"No man is poor or desolate who has this treasure for his own. When the landscape darkens and the trembling pilgrim comes to the valley named of the Shadow, he is not afraid to enter: he takes the rod and the staff of Scripture in his hand; he says to friend and comrade, 'Goodby, we shall meet again'; and comforted by that support, he goes toward the lonely pass as one who walks through darkness into light." [1]

Only short-sighted parents are so foolish as to deprive their children of the future strength for life of which the poet-preacher has so beautifully written. Only by learning the way early to these quiet springs of peace and power do we make them our own for future emergencies. Few people discover the Bible in old age; though many rediscover it then with gladness, after decades of neglect. Let us win the future thankfulness of our children

[1] Van Dyke, Henry, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

by helping them discover early the book of books. They will be doubly happy if we guide them first to the Children's Bible, later to the *Book of Youth's Ideals;* and spare them by saving for their later study the parts of the Bible so evidently outside their interests and beyond their comprehension. So much of the Bible was evidently written by adults for adults, that in fairness to the Bible itself as well as in kindness to the immature, we must grade the Bible for our children and youth.

AN INDISPENSABLE PART OF MODERN CULTURE

No one could understand or appreciate the marvellous art of ancient Greece and its Roman reflections, as seen in the great galleries in Florence, Rome, Paris and London, without studying the classical mythology which was its inspiration. It is equally true that the best key to modern and medieval art and all Christian culture is the Bible. The really great artists throughout the Christian era, in any of the fields of art, have found their highest inspirations in the Book of Books. Handel's "Messiah," Mendelssohn's "Elijah" and "St. Paul," Wagner's "Parsifal," Haydn's "Creation" and the thrilling anthems of Gounod suggest the

vast influence of the Bible in the history of music. "All the world's greatest music was inspired by religion," says Dr. George Whitefield Andrews, himself a great musician and composer.

Likewise the greatest paintings and mosaics are products of religion as well as of art, and cannot be fully appreciated by a person who does not know his Bible. The glorious work of Raphael in the halls of the Vatican is sometimes called "Raphael's Bible," it illuminates so many Bible scenes. Likewise the equally majestic frescoes by Michael Angelo in the Sistine Chapel might well be called Michael Angelo's Bible. The latter's noble conceptions of the prophets and other great Bible characters, and of the Creation, the Fall and the Hope of Redemption, have long held the admiration of the world. We find whole series of Bible events immortalized in bronze on Ghiberti's famous gates to the baptistry in Florence, and in fadeless mosaics, such as the exquisite work in St. Peter's at Rome, and St. Mark's in Venice and the lovely façades of the cathedrals at Orvieto and Sienna.

Every great painter has given a Madonna to the world, and sometimes many, in the endeavor to make real to men the sacredness of motherhood.

It is the favorite subject in the realm of art. The Madonnas of Raphael, da Vinci, Bellini, Corregio, and Murillo, in all the great galleries and many ancient churches, almost make Protestants as well as Catholics worship their own mothers. Botticelli's "Nativity," now in London, and Fra Lippi's "Adoration of the Magi" have taken us all back to the manger in Bethlehem; also Murillo's "Immaculate Conception," and the "Holy Family," by Fra Bartolomeo, Titian, del Sarto and Reynolds.

Tissot, a modern French painter, has reproduced every scene in the life of Christ, after sketching five years in Palestine. His settings are much truer than Veronese's, for instance, who never saw the Holy Land; and yet the latter has given us gorgeous pictures of Christ at the marriage at Cana, and at the feasts at the houses of Simon and of Levi. Among the deathless works of art are Titian's "Assumption," his "Presentation in the Temple," and his "Entombment of Christ," Rembrandt's "Supper at Emmaus"; Bellini's "Christ in Gethsemane"; Rubens' "Descent from the Cross," Guido Reni's profoundly affecting "Ecce Homo"; Leonardo da Vinci's famous "Last Supper"; and supremely Raphael's "Transfiguration," the most

wonderful picture in the world. Many would add the very human work of Hofmann, especially his "Christ Among the Doctors," and "The Fisherman." And the striking mural paintings of the Old Testament prophets, by Sargent, in the Boston Public Library, remind us that the noblest type of even American art also gets its inspiration from the Bible.

To be thrilled by these great masters, expensive foreign travel is no longer necessary, for excellent reproductions are now available, and fair copies in miniature for a pittance apiece. Priceless treasures of the world of beauty, they are all now within the reach even of the children of the poor. Yet they are of little avail except to those who hold the key, which must come from a knowledge of the Bible.

THE KEY TO ENGLISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE

The Bible has been born again in the literature of every Christian race. So deeply is it involved in English literature, so full of biblical allusions are all our great poets, novelists and essayists, it is doubtful if these English classics could long sur-

vive, if we ceased to be a Bible-reading people. Shakespeare with more than twelve hundred allusions to the Bible is already a bore to many who do not know the Bible, because they cannot understand him. Tennyson, with his five hundred references to the Bible, is lost to them; and Browning is a closed book to them with more than six hundred allusions to the Scriptures in a single poem, "The Ring and the Book." [1]

Without the Bible we should never have had Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* or Milton's *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained* or *Samson Agonistes*, or Browning's *Saul*, or Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities*. When Landor praised Dickens' literary style and asked the great novelist where he got it, the instant reply was, "Why, from the New Testament, of course." Similarly, Hawthorne confessed that he owed his inspiration chiefly to the Bible and *Pilgrim's Progress*. We owe Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* to the book of Ecclesiastes. We owe Bryant's "Thanatopsis" to the book of Job. We owe Wordsworth's "Ode to Immortality" to St. Paul's great immortality chapter in I Corinthians. Byron's "Darkness" came from Jeremiah. Spenser's "Red

[1] According to Miss Machen, *The Bible in Browning*.

Cross Knight" came from the Ephesians. Kipling's "Recessional" came from Deuteronomy.

Edmund Burke, the great British orator, was accustomed to read a chapter from Isaiah before speaking in the House of Commons; and similarly, Daniel Webster read aloud privately the majestic sentences of the 139th Psalm before several of his great orations in the Senate. The novels of Scott, Dickens, Thackery and George Eliot abound in biblical allusions and more recent novelists like Thomas Hardy and Hall Caine also refer frequently to this greatest of all classics. Carlyle, Addison, Ruskin and all the great essayists have enriched their writings frequently from the same unfailing source of inspiration.

Van Dyke owes his drama, "The House of Rimmon," to the book of II Kings. From the same source came Byron's poem, "Destruction of Sennacherib's Army." Longfellow owed his poem "Naboth's Vineyard" to I Kings and his "Judas Maccabæus" to the Apocrypha, also his poem, "The Warning," to the story of Samson in Judges. Byron owed his "Belshazzar's Feast" to the story of Daniel.

A recent text-book of Old Testament study con-

tains fifty pages of typical quotations from the leading poets, with interesting biblical allusions, to be used to test the pupil's knowledge of the Old Testament.[1] Here are stanzas from many of the poems of Lowell, Whittier, Van Dyke, Longfellow, Tennyson, Dryden, Holmes, Shakespeare, Mrs. Browning, Pope, Keats and Milton, including some of the noblest poetry in the English language. It is a fine sort of test for Bible study. Surely our young people who fail in this test cannot claim to be educated. They lack one of the first requisites of real culture if they cannot explain their own best literature—just because they do not know the Bible, which is so deeply rooted in the literature, the culture and racial experience of this Bible-reading race. To be true to our Anglo-Saxon heritage, as well as to the vital interests of our own children, we must teach them the Bible.

THE CALL FOR A BOOK OF THE BIBLE'S BEST

Although the Bible is an incomparable source book for all kinds of high and noble inspirations,

[1] McEntire, Adele Tuttle, *Outline Studies in Old Testament History.* The Abingdon Press.

musical, artistic and literary, as well as spiritual and moral, not all of the Bible is inspiring. As a practical matter, the Bible is far too long. Some of it, like the old genealogies, is valuable only to the student of archeology or anthropology, and should long ago have been put in a separate volume for their occasional use. Some of it is a duplication, like the books of the Chronicles, repeating Samuel and Kings. Some of it is completely out of date and useless today, like the old Jewish ceremonial law which Jesus himself superseded. Some of it reflects the cruder taste of rougher times and should be expurgated.

It is interesting to note that the International Lesson Committee, a very conservative body, although claiming to cover the Bible in every cycle of eight years, in all their fifty-six years of history have been able to use only thirty-five per cent of the chapters of the Bible; and they never have had a lesson in the nine books of Lamentations, Song of Solomon, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Philemon, II and III John or Jude. It is a very rare Christian who ever reads any of these books.

Your Bible is really just the part that you make your own by faithful use and study. The rest

might just as well be blank pages, so far as you are concerned. If a thousand active, earnest and intelligent Christians should honestly report on the chapters in the Bible that really *live* in their experience, and the chapters that they never read any more because they find nothing inspiring in them or relevant to their modern lives, what would the result be? Doubtless a large part of the Scriptures would be found to be practically useless, except for very rare reference. Fully a third of the whole Bible would very likely fall into this category. Let every family have one complete Bible for occasional reference, but have the *Book of the Bible's Best* for practical daily use. Millions of dollars a year would be saved in printing costs, and that would be the least important gain. If only the interesting and inspiring chapters were printed in the Bibles intended for devotional use, *far more people would read them.*

Untold millions of ordinary folks try to get acquainted with the Bible, but find it dreary reading because they do not know where to find the interesting portions. They find the "morning stories" in Genesis quite interesting, but they get discouraged when they strike the genealogies, and frankly bored

when they get to the out-of-date laws of sacrifices and ancient ritual, and weary again when they try to wade through the border warfare of the ancient Hebrews. After which the most natural question in the world is, "What has all this to do with religion?" Common sense tells them it has historical value, but very little religious value today.

A carefully selected Bible, prepared for the devotional use of adults, retaining all of the beautiful portions, all the important narratives, all the inspirational messages, but leaving out what no longer has any religious usefulness, would be a far more popular Bible. Many folks would actually learn to use it who have sampled the old Bible unsuccessfully and given it up in despair. Such a devotional Bible would be a more living book. Kent's *The Shorter Bible* has its merits, though, being only a personal translation, it carries less authority.[1] Some day the progressive Protestant denominations may unite in the enterprise of producing a *Book of the Bible's Best*, for devotional purposes, in attractive form and free from obsolete material. Its wonderful inspirational passages will then be easily found and will be more

[1] Kent, C. F., *The Shorter Bible.* Charles Scribner's Sons.

frequently read. Possibly the Bible needs to be rescued from its friends!

ADAPTING THE BIBLE TO THE NEEDS OF CHILDREN

There is a beautiful and fascinating Children's Bible, disguised in the grown-up language of the family Bible. Many children never find it, because it is hard to find, so much of the Scriptures was written for adults. Some discouraged parents have said to the author that they doubt if modern children, so highly favored with up-to-date schools and attractive modern text-books, can really find much to interest them in the old-fashioned Bible. Its form is antiquated and unattractive to them. Its language is often obsolete and sounds too preachy, and it uses too many long words that only grown folks can understand. And it talks too much about matters that do not count at all in the child's world. There are too many theological letters, too many prophet's speeches, too many bloody wars, too many tiresome rules about when to wash and what animals to sacrifice. These things mean nothing but a bore to children.

Yet the Bible can be made a children's book,

and one that the children love. In recent years a dozen attempts have been made to arrange a Bible for children, and some of these books are quite useful. At least three things are necessary to make a successful children's Bible—elimination, translation and transformation. What has no appeal to children and interests only adults should be omitted. What is selected must have religious value for children and vital interest to them. It should be put in story form whenever possible. Then it needs to be translated into the language of childhood. Grown-up English will not do; it is largely a foreign tongue. The Bible for little children of two to seven years should be mostly in words of one syllable. And the Bible for older children, from eight to twelve, should be in simple language which they themselves can easily read. Then the book should be entirely transformed and not look like an adult's Bible. It should be printed in large type, on good paper, with enough pictures to help imagination, but selected with extreme care. The stories should not be interrupted by chapter and verse divisions or marginal notes, or they will not look like stories at all.

On the desk before us is one of the best samples

of a children's Bible that has yet been printed.[1] It is only six years old, but is already widely used by children. It has transformed the Bible into a lovely book of modern appearance, extremely attractive to children, with good paper, large type, and thirty-two well-chosen, beautiful, full-page pictures. Its translation is not quite so perfect as its form. It is quite beyond the capacity of a little child. Even the child of ten must be rather precocious to use it. Its vocabulary is too extensive and some of its words are too heavy. It uses, now and then, such language as "responsible," "consecrate," "volunteered," "invincible," "idolatrous," "misleading," "exceedingly," "detestable" and "iniquities." A bright child of eleven would love the book and understand it. Younger children must grow to it.

For the most part its selection of material is to be highly commended. By wise and generous omissions, it has made the Bible seem wonderfully childlike. It leaves out most of the ancient laws, recites no genealogies, omits most of the prophets and nearly all the epistles, says nothing of Ezra, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations or Song of Solomon,

[1] Sherman and Kent, *The Children's Bible,* Charles Scribner's Sons.

cuts Hebrews to one great chapter and Revelation to four thrilling pages. In this writer's judgment it should have cut a little deeper and omitted the ghastly story of Jael murdering Sisera in his sleep, which would keep a nervous child awake half the night; and of Abraham's attempt to sacrifice his own son, a story which has made many children "disappointed in God";[1] also the story of Jephthah's foolish vow and his cruel murder of his own daughter, and some of the bloody stories of wars with the Philistines, including King Saul's ignominious suicide. All this has no religious value for children and may do sensitive children positive harm. The story of Job, though skillfully abridged, is doubtless of no value in a children's Bible. They cannot understand the problem of suffering. It is rather cruel to expect them to try.

But these blemishes are few and the book is large and full of vital appeal to children. The simple stories of the patriarchs and of Joseph and Moses are told in straightforward fashion. Brave Joshua and Gideon are duly honored. The story of Samson is cleverly handled, as the "strong man who lost his strength," for he "did to others as they

[1] See Griggs-Smith's startling revelations of the effects of this story upon children, in *The Child's Knowledge of God*, pp. 36-62. London, Macmillan & Company.

did to him." Ruth's devotion is made beautiful, and Samuel, Jonathan and David appear as heroes. Briefly the lessons of Absolom, Solomon, Rehoboam and Ahab the thief are recited. Then the majestic prophet Elijah is introduced effectively and the story of a few other prophets is briefly told —Elisha, Micaiah, Isaiah, "the young man who said 'Send me' " and Jeremiah the brave and patriotic sufferer. More fully and with dramatic appeal, the stories of Esther, Daniel and Nehemiah are told with real power, but would be still more effective if told in the first person, singular, as Jane Eayre Fryer tells them.[1] Interest lags with the Job discussion, and the Old Testament section closes with a fresh translation of the best Psalms and the Sayings of the Wise—rather too didactic to interest children.

A true climax is accomplished in the New Testament third of the book. The story of Jesus is told with such remarkable vividness (like the gospel of Mark in modern translation) that he stands out as a living, breathing person, splendidly real to children. Most of the book of the Acts is laid under tribute also. It is full of thrilling adventure, a

[1] Fryer, Mrs. J. E., *The Bible Story Book for Boys and Girls.* John C. Winston Company.

great book for boys. It rightly makes St. Paul seem one of the greatest heroes and the enterprise of the early church one of the most stirring adventures in all history. Boys and girls who make this book their own and dream over these stories, so beautifully told, cannot fail to have their imagination stirred to noble deeds, and their motives for right living strengthened, while the challenge of the Christ, so vividly presented as the hero of heroes, is rather sure to win their loyalty.

THE MATCHLESS BOOK OF IDEALS FOR YOUTH

Dr. William Lyon Phelps, popular professor of English at Yale, pays this high tribute to the Bible: "I thoroughly believe in a university education for both men and women; but I believe a knowledge of the Bible without a college education is more valuable than a college course without the Bible. No other learning or culture, no matter how extensive or elegant, can form a proper substitute for it." This is high praise for the Bible, coming from so eminent an authority in the field of literature. He doubtless had in mind the facts we emphasized in the first part of this chapter, that the Bible was the necessary key to the world's finest culture, art

and literature. It is equally true that the Bible is the great source book of moral enthusiasm, the matchless book of ideals for youth.

The great character studies in the Bible are particularly useful for young people. They are most interested in personality, the way their heroes became great, and the ideals which were the secret of their greatness. Though they may have read the great classic biographies of the Scriptures in their childhood, they find fresh meanings in them when they study them again in youth. This is especially true of their review of the gospels. The full values of the high courage, the extreme unselfishness, the persistent life purpose and the heroic self-sacrifice of Jesus they could not appreciate as children. Now in adolescence they discover the noble idealism back of it all. They see in Christ their own noblest ideals personified.

The Bible for Youth is somewhat larger than the Children's Bible. Their growing experience makes it possible for them to understand the messages of the prophets, if historically interpreted. Amos', Micah's and Isaiah's challenge of social injustice and ringing appeals for social righteousness can be made to stir the hearts of fair-minded youth. Some great chapters in the epistles, like the great

faith chapter in Hebrews, the Christian soldier's chapter in Ephesians, the temptation chapter in James; Paul's great love and immortality chapters in I Corinthians, and his three great chapters in Romans, (5, 8, 12) which may be called, respectively, the reconciliation chapter, the triumph chapter and the consecration chapter; those eloquent passages in praise of the Christ, Ephesians 1 and Philippians 2, also I Peter 1; the two letters to the young man Timothy, especially chapters 6 in the first and 2 and 4 in the second, on the struggle for character—all have vital appeal to thoughtful young folks. Deepening experience opens to them some of the riches of the finest of the Psalms, some of the wisdom passages in Proverbs and even the Youth and Old Age chapter at the end of Ecclesiastes. Many other passages might be suggested that have living value for our young people.

Fortunately for the present generation of youth, the recent revival of religious drama, which Protestants for four centuries have foolishly avoided, is now making the great episodes and personalities of the Bible live again with remarkable vividness. In no other way can the stories of the Bible be made so real. This method is giving the old Bible a new lease of life with our young folks. They are sur-

prised to find so much power and living meaning in it. They discover that some of the old heroes of the past were wonderfully human and their personal problems and struggles were remarkably modern.

In many churches in the winter season the young people study and present one of the new religious dramas, like "The Rock," the prize play of 1924, or "Joseph the Dreamer," or "Nehemiah the Builder," first in their own church, then in a few neighboring churches. It is a valuable experience, often a vital religious experience, in which the young folks in the cast discover moral and spiritual realities. The most vivid appeal to imagination is by way of the acted story. To play the part of Joseph, from the pasture at Dothan to Pharaoh's court, is to discover how Joseph actually felt and thought and worked out his life problems. To play the title role in "The Rock" is to incarnate Simon Peter afresh and to understand his struggles and what comradeship with Jesus meant to him. Through such impersonations the young people discover the underlying ideals in the lives of the biblical characters and learn the secret of their success or failure. To discover the noblest ideals and then rehearse them and adopt them for

their own is the most important work our youth can find. The biblical dramatics method enables them to do this with very happy results.

A new appreciation of the Bible will come to young people who study its remarkable influence upon the world's art and literature. Among the excellent guides to this kind of study are *The Gospel in Art*, by Bailey,[1] and Volume VIII of *The Book of Life*, by Hall and Wood.[2] The former gives an artist's interpretation of the great religious paintings. The latter treats first of "the Bible in stone," in the great cathedrals, sculptures and mosaics; then shows and interprets some of the noblest paintings; and finally discusses several hundred quotations from the Bible in English and American literature. A study like this would open the eyes of the young students to the cultural worth of the Bible and could not fail to increase greatly their respect for the Book of books.

Parents of modern American young people need not think that it is a hopeless task to interest their young folks any longer in the old Bible. To be sure, it is a more difficult task, because of the great breadth of their interests and the rich variety of

[1] Bailey, A. E., *The Gospel in Art*. The Pilgrim Press.
[2] Hall, N. M., and Wood, I. S., *The Book of Life*, 8 vols. John Rudin & Company.

stimulus in their eager, vivid, colorful lives. The Bible is not simply a book for old folks and children. It still remains the finest source book for the ideals of living which all right-minded youth are grateful to discover.

Chapter XIX

Home Coöperation with the Church

In all social problems of our complicated age, coöperation is a word to conjure with. We are so interdependent, we simply must coöperate. Aloofness means failure. This is as true of institutions as of persons. Success depends upon vital contacts, personal relations, effective alliances, in short, team-work. Although this book is a plea for a home-centered life, for a deeper loyalty to family that makes the home central, and not centrifugal; though we have deprecated the extent to which the old home functions have been scattered and new social agencies multiplied, we have recognized the necessity for much of this specialization. It is an index of rising civilization and culture. The chief danger lies in neglecting to maintain vital relations between the family and these social agencies it has created to share its great task.

HOME COÖPERATION WITH THE CHURCH

It is only when the home cuts itself off from the school, the playground, the factory, the library, the recreation center and the church, and never interests itself in them or coöperates with them, that a vicious separation follows which is detrimental to all concerned. The selfish family is likely to do this, to get relief from tasks and burdens and be free for its own plans and pleasures. It is unfair to the children and ultimately suicidal for the home. But let the family keep alive its neighborly relations with all these groups and activities in which any of its members share, as it should in justice both to itself and them, and it knits them all together in a fine team-work which builds an efficient community.

WHO IS REALLY EDUCATING YOUR BOY?

Are you under the illusion that you are bringing up your own child and providing his education? Perhaps you do not know who is really educating him. Is it his day-school teacher? Possibly not so much as she thinks. Is it his church-school teacher and his minister? Perhaps very little. How much is he learning at the movies? What is he learning from the papers, especially the

"funnies"? Are the boys of the neighborhood educating him? All you can be sure of is that he is really educating himself, and that all his social contacts are sharing in the process, in about the relative proportion of the time exposure of each, and the vividness of the experience, with the resulting degree to which he responds to the stimuli.

It is very necessary to check up occasionally on all the social contacts of our children, so far as we can discover them, and to learn the depth of the impression they are making and the nature of their total influence. A certain discerning mother was puzzled to discover why her three small boys had grown so pale and listless and seemed to take so little interest in their school work. What little studying they did they hurried through before supper, and then would slip out to spend the evening "with the other boys." They became quite unmanageable, resenting any sort of home restraint. Quite in despair, the mother followed them one evening. She was appalled to find them keeping sly tryst with a few cronies in the back room of an old saloon, to listen to the exciting tales of a maudlin old soldier who shared his home brew with them in return for their admiration and their pocket money.

HOME COÖPERATION WITH THE CHURCH

Sometimes the most effective educating is done surreptitiously, when the family little dream of the harm of it. Among the many personal influences reaching that boy, the one that enlists his most vital interest and activity is the one that really educates him. To compete with education by stealth, which attacks the listless and lazy, the best plan is to keep the boy healthily occupied with active, worth-while interests. It is only the empty life that is really in great danger.

COÖPERATING WITH COMMUNITY AGENCIES

The active good will of every Christian family is due each constructive agency which helps build the community. Service on a community-chest committee or hospital board, active support of the local Y. M. C. A., including personal service as well as the annual check, and participation in political and civic affairs requiring the investment of time and thought, are typical tests of good will in the genuinely social family. Plenty of families are worth nothing to their community because they refuse to play the game with community agencies.

Parents who are really interested in their children's education have a chance to prove it by keep-

ing on friendly terms with teachers and school superintendent and following closely the work of the children in school. Parent-teachers associations vary greatly in efficiency, but they can be made vital organizations of great mutual value to school and home. They furnish a convenient medium for discussion of school policy and the share the parents can take in helping promote it. The least the parents can do is to assure the teachers of their confidence and appreciation of their service of the children. Such intimate personal service as faithful teachers render cannot be repaid simply in money. We should remember that the teachers who are educating our children are really working for the family, not simply for the city. Let us give them the appreciation they deserve and treat them as members of the family council.

The best results follow when parents keep closely in touch with the progress their children are making in each study and learn from each teacher what they can do to help at home. This personal interest on the part of parents also impresses and encourages the child. It shows him how important the parents regard his school work, and it braces him for better endeavors. One reason some boys

discount their school work and slight it all they can is because their parents ignore it altogether. Parents secure returns in the educational progress of their children about in proportion to the interest they take in the process themselves.

THE HOUSE OF THE INTERPRETER

Several other social institutions in the average community deserve the active coöperation of the home, but none more so than the church. There are churches that are vital social institutions with active young people's work; and there are half-dead churches that neglect the young folks or lose them through sheer ineptness. If the latter description fits your church, all the more reason for your taking a hand in its work and improving its young people's program. With right leadership, the church is a real "House of the Interpreter" for our young folks, teaching them the inner meanings of life.

In early youth our children are making swift strides in self-discovery and their horizons are rapidly widening. Eager enthusiasms and multiplying interests are enriching their life; but they

are in danger of choosing the lesser good and missing the best. Religion's interpretation of life's highest values is their most vital need. To be sure, their day school, as well as their home, has taught them much of life's inner meaning already. They should know that a noble oak is not to be measured simply in board feet or a great painting judged by the area of its canvas. They have gained perspective by the study of history. Science has led them into many of the fascinating secrets of life. But have they yet grasped the inner unity of life? Have they found a real God at the heart of all things, the great soul of life itself? Do they realize that the eternal things are not the things they can touch and see? Have they learned the sacredness of sex, the function that makes possible the birth of an immortal soul? Have they yet listened to the deep undertones of a world in struggle, that calls for their help and devoted service? Often it takes an understanding minister, who has the full confidence of youth, to convince them that real life is spiritual and eternal, and that they are missing its meaning, until they interpret it in terms of the invisible Spirit and his mighty purposes. The church has such a unique opportunity, the home

should by all means coöperate with it, for the best welfare of the children.

CHARACTER VALUES OF RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

Too frequently a layman's privilege in the church is just listening and paying the bills. But this is rather futile for young folks. That is why they abandon that kind of a church. Successful young people's churches provide a program of activity, and in sharing in these activities they develop character. Our church schools are learning to become *schools of Christian living*—an ideal name for the Sunday school, for it should be a behavior clinic, rather than a singing school, or a children's church or just a discussion group. The efficient church provides ample scope for the religious expression of its young people, through their meetings of social worship, with freedom for expressing their aspirations and convictions; through participation in dramatic programs and pageantry with its unique educational value as well as public service; through sharing in the choir work, the ushering, the collection, distributing the bulletins and sometimes even printing them, and serving as the minister's aids in a score of ways.

Participation in the gospel of service has fully as great religious value for them, and the active church will employ its youth in its outreach among the poor, the sick, the shut-ins and neglected. There is no finer way for two or even four young folks to spend half their Sunday afternoons than to sing the old well-loved hymns in the hospitals and the homes of the aged and crippled. Our young people should be given an increasing share in the church's work of community service. It would develop their capacity for sympathy by the practice of kindness.

Nor will the church forget the social needs of our young folks themselves. It is not simply the homeless young folks in the rooming-house section of the city that appreciate the pleasant Sunday afternoon in the church parlors in the winter, and the young people's evening around the fireplace in the family church where an evening preaching service is far less necessary than a young people's night. Some successful churches serve the needs of their youth by extending such a meeting to two hours or the entire evening, while the young folks come and go; beginning early sometimes with a simple supper, at other times ending with light refreshments and a sing around the piano; with a large part of

the time spent informally in a homelike sort of way, with the minister and his wife as hosts. A great variety of programs can be adapted to such a human setting, and in these the young folks, of course, should share. When the minister is wise and skillful, the church need not be just an old folks' institution.

LIVING CONTACTS BETWEEN HOME AND CHURCH

Wise parents build a circle of friendly guardians about each of their children. It should not be too obvious—just a mystic group of next friends, ministers, teachers in day school and church school, "Y-sec.," "big brother," and parents, all in league to insure for that boy the best chance in the world. The more the parents keep up the contacts, the better this mystic league will work. Many church leaders, anxious to serve the children and youth more effectively, regret the lack of home coöperation that makes this so difficult. Perhaps two-thirds of parents send their children to Sunday school as they send them to day school and then ignore their teachers. No wonder results are often so meager.

Common courtesy suggests that the home should

consider a faithful church-school teacher as a family friend and benefactor. She often deserves deep appreciation for a quality of service which neither parent is really capable of rendering that child. The least parents can do is to keep in contact with the process and show a personal interest in what the teacher is doing. In these days of graded lessons, parents should know the course each child is taking, and should follow it themselves and discover its definite objectives in character growth. Fine team-work is possible here. Assistance in learning the lesson is helpful, but even more important is the arranging of home projects to supplement the projects planned by the teacher. A new "life-centered curriculum," now in preparation, will very soon be promoted in American church schools, built around this project method. Definite teamwork will then become even more necessary between parents and teachers, in planning the children's projects. Through such strategic means, a far more effective religious education will be developed within the next few years, if parents are only willing to help.

For a number of years the Episcopal church has sought definite coöperation from the family by a well-developed system of monthly letters to par-

ents, in connection with every course in their graded series.[1] Though these printed letters are rather formal, and form letters are always somewhat discounted, they at least accomplish this: the parents are informed every month just what each child is studying, just what home preparation is expected, and what the home can do to help. This should be done by every church school, though in a more flexible, personal way, and with greater emphasis on the moral objectives, and the purpose of the course in terms of character development. When the church fails to do this, the home should take the initiative. It is obvious that the children whose parents take the most intelligent interest in what the church is doing for them get the greatest help from the church. They are the children who take the deepest interest themselves in religious education, because of the vital interest of their parents. It is entirely natural. The parents reap as they have sown.

The church, with all its human faults, is the executive agency of the kingdom of God's good will. It has vast powers, often latent within it, infinite possibilities, spiritual and social. It can

[1] *The Christian Nurture Series.* Morehouse Publishing Company.

be made the closest ally and most efficient friend of the family in the great task of child nurture. If not, it is somebody's fault. Modern families can develop modern churches, if they will, capable of serving the highest needs of modern young folks. Your church is just as effective and as good as you make it. But this is a task too often attempted by proxy. On this basis it is rather sure to fail. Parents who merely *send* their children to church should not expect undeserved miracles to happen. Real home coöperation with the church begins with the personal loyalty of the father and the mother to the church of their fathers.

Chapter XX

Rebuilding the Temple of Home Religion

Our study of the problem of the modern family has discovered some light and many shadows. It is not a subject for careless optimism. Nor is it any subject for a pessimist. He soon gives up in despair and declares it insoluble. We have found, however, that the families that have come the nearest to solving this problem, or banishing it, are the religious families. This suggests clearly that the solution must be found in religion, in a social religion like that which Jesus taught and lived.

Nor is it likely that the present generation in any large numbers will solve this problem. We have solved the woman problem. We have set woman free. But in solving this latter problem we have temporarily complicated the problem of the family. Emancipated women, having achieved full personality and complete citizenship, require new adjustments in marriage; so the family type is

being modified, and new social strains ensue. We are understanding better the nature of the problem. We are trying social experiments with it. We are discovering fresh difficulty in it. But our generation has not solved it.

SOLUTION AWAITS THE COMING OF A BETTER RACE

If you are a pessimist, you will say it never can be solved. You will claim that human nature is essentially selfish, the interests of husband and wife are inevitably competitive, and "human nature cannot be changed." But if you are a person of faith, and therefore of intellectual courage and reasoned optimism, you will know that human nature *can* be changed for the better; that this process has long been making progress, and that, in the better world that is to be, there will be a better family life. More unselfish, more self-controlled, Christian men and women will produce a better family, in a truly Christian home.

In short, the solution of the problem of the family *awaits the coming of a better race.* Christ died to rid the world of selfishness, its most popular and most deadly disease. His spirit is slowly transforming the world and the Golden Rule is grad-

ually conquering. Where the Christ spirit has won its victory over selfish individualism, where self-control has conquered lust, where love and religion have provided strong motives for home loyalty—there is no longer a family problem. The thoroughly Christian home has solved it. Gradually such homes are producing the better race, a race with the ideals of Jesus and the motive power of religion, which is the only power strong enough to make these high ideals actual, and incarnate them in life.

Dr. Cope saw clearly when he said "What we call the home problem is more truly a *family* problem. It centers in persons. The solution awaits a race with new ideals, educated to live as more than dust, for more than dirt, for personality rather than for possessions. We need young people who establish homes, not simply because they feel miserable when separated, nor because one needs a place in which to board, and the other needs a boarder, but because the largest duty and joy of life is to enrich the world with other lives and to give themselves in high love to making those other lives of the greatest possible worth to the world." [1]

[1] Cope, Henry F., *Religious Education in the Family*, p. 2. The University of Chicago Press.

Motherhood is a marvelous conqueror of selfishness. Many a selfish girl has been purged of selfishness, to a remarkable degree, by the experience of motherhood. Our modern homes, with fewer children, are discovering their preciousness. The rare is usually more precious. Hence it has come about that our present generation has put a strong new emphasis on the social importance of child welfare. The better race is founded on this cornerstone, the welfare of the child. It is no mere coincidence that at the entrance to the church, within whose walls began this special study of the family, is this inscription cut in stone, "IS IT WELL WITH THE CHILD?" *The home is for the children.* Its purpose is not the selfish pleasure of the parents. Herein is the sharp, clear-cut distinction between the Christian family and the partnership styled companionate marriage.

A COMMUNITY CHALLENGE AND A WORTHY ANSWER

The author has written this book with a constant sense of indebtedness to the earnest group of people who called him to study with them the problem of the suburban family, under the patronage of their

vigorous, enterprising church. They shared with him the hospitality of their lovely homes. They also trusted him with some of the anxieties of their troubled hearts. For five months they met regularly to discuss many aspects of the problem and gradually came to substantial agreement as to the main points at issue and a constructive policy to meet the challenge involved. At the last session of the group, the following statement, after being carefully discussed and reëdited, paragraph by paragraph, was adopted unanimously by the group by rising vote. It is presented here as the best result of our group-thinking on how to stop the subtle trend toward pagan homes:

THE MODERNIZING OF FAMILY RELIGION

"After our five-months' study of the modern family and religion, we people of Fairmount Church and the Cleveland Heights community have thoughtfully come to the following conclusions:

"We realize the startling seriousness of the family situation in our modern suburban life, yet we are thankful to live in the difficult challenging present. Though fully mindful of our debt to our early homes, earnest Christian homes, we would not

go back to 'the good old times' if we could. We thank God for our modern homes, our modern schools and churches, our modern world and our modern children. We are thankful not simply for creature comforts, home conveniences and material gains, but also for broader horizons, for escape from superstition and bigotry, for a better organized social life, for the new freedom achieved by our womanhood and their belated opportunity, and for our higher standards of applied Christianity. We believe we are living in a greater and a better world than our grandfathers knew, with more humaneness, square-dealing, fair play and good will. We are thankful to live *today*.

"However, we do not allow ourselves to be blinded by our optimism. We frankly face the fact, that with all our modern privilege, our family problems are complicated by changing social standards, and the very opulence of life. Even our moral ideals are threatened by the reckless speeding up of this automotive age. We are conscious of a nervous tension and frequent overstrain which bodes ill for our restless, hectic, city living. We are aware that too often our luxury breeds self-indulgence, disregard of the rights of others and a thoughtless life of mere sense-level pleasures. We

reluctantly admit that not only these dangers threaten our homes, but also a subtle new sex complex, resulting from the new feminine freedom, increasingly daring realism in literature, the movies and the stage, and a general revolt against conventions. These conditions lead us to the conviction that never did the world need the spiritual help of religion and its ideals of social righteousness more than today, in spite of all our modern achievements and progress.

"We accept the challenge of this situation, as a solemn duty, believing that the welfare of our families depends upon our meeting it constructively. We dare not longer drift complacently along, either blind to the facts or oblivious to their consequences. We believe we must make the effort to reconstruct religion in our modern homes, whatever it may cost us in curtailed selfishness and individual preference. In the spirit of a new consecration to our homes and to our children, we pledge ourselves to this higher level of family loyalty:

"1. We recognize that the rights and the welfare of our children must have the *right of way*. We admit that we have nothing to live for more

important than this. For this purpose chiefly our homes were founded.

"2. If we have been giving the right of way to our personal comfort, our social ambitions, our business profits, or our personal pleasures, and self-indulgence, this must quit, for the children's sake, or we know disaster will follow. If 'individualism has run amuck' in our homes, with each on the quest of his own pleasures and selfish aims, we must somehow get back to a *home-centered life.* We pledge ourselves to the endeavor to build up again the old family loyalty, the old group spirit of all for each and each for all. In spite of difficulties, we will strive to maintain, if possible, a real home between four walls, not a mere lodging and irregular cafeteria. We will study the science of home-making and its fine arts. We will try to lift it to the status of a professional career and enrich it with every possible beauty and fine efficiency.

"3. As parents we will do our best to keep young with our children, by sharing their interests, their friends and their fun, their studies and their reading, and their youthful outlook on life problems. We will share with them our plans, our hopes and a fair share of our leisure time and

holidays. We will strive to keep vital, mentally alert and young in our feelings and enthusiasms. Thus we will plan for more home-centered fellowship and family recreation, more sharing of life, cost what it may in sacrifice of selfish adult interests.

"4. Realizing the serious slump in family authority and discipline, we will strive to make our homes a true democracy; not the despotism of the old-time family where children had no voice, nor the anarchy of the indulgent, ultra-modern home where spoiled children are the tyrants; but a true home-democracy, with mutual respect for personality and the new discipline based on a reasoning obedience to reasonable requests, with responsibility shared with trusted children.

"5. We will not abdicate responsibility for the *moral welfare* of our children, nor turn over this function to school or church. God helping us, we will try to endow them with the great moral safeguards of life—self-control, self-respect, a sense of honor and the spirit of chivalry. By faithful instruction and the homely projects of the household, we will practice them in the homespun virtues of patience, kindness, sympathy, love, truthfulness,

honesty, reliability, the sense of justice and regard for fair play.

"6. We are acutely conscious of the hopelessness of this task of character growth without the help of *religion*. We know that religion must be the motive of it all, its inner spirit and power. We therefore face the necessity of a vital religion, frankly acknowledged and honestly lived in our relations with our children. We sincerely desire that sort of religion which is a human experience of God's life and love in the midst of life's ordinary tasks and tests. We covet a vital, life-giving relationship with the Supreme Power at the heart of life, that was the simple, genuine religion of Jesus himself.

"We realize that many of us, confused by conflicting voices of divergent faiths, have lost the old Bible and have not yet found the new; and in an age of half-understood science have not recovered that reasoning faith in prayer which makes it a channel of power between our hearts and the Living Presence of our Father God. We pledge ourselves to open the Bible again for fresh study, in the light of modern learning, to find its high inspirations for our hearts and for our homes. We agree to revive the simple prayer custom of Jesus,

at least to bless our family meals with the grace of thanksgiving. We will strive to make prayer more real to us and to our children by practicing the Presence of God and acknowledging our dependence upon him.

"Believing that in these days of threatened family disaster we cannot put moral safety into our homes without the safeguards and spiritual help of vital religion, we have come to the conclusion that we must thus make our personal religion more courageous and outspoken, more honest and frank, as well as more in accordance with the intelligent and progressive spirit of the times. Only thus can we win our modern young people to a personal loyalty to Jesus Christ and his ideals of living.

"7. And finally we pledge our loyalty anew to our church and its program of religious education for the welfare of our children. We will strive to coöperate more steadfastly with it, and with all other community agencies which are helping our homes to raise up a generation of children and youth to meet victoriously the subtle temptations of present-day living and the challenging tests of the future.

"In thus resolving to rebuild the Temple of Home Religion, we seek not simply to restore a

neglected altar in a corner shrine apart from ordinary living, but to carry the sacred flame of its altar fires into all our home life, making holy all its work and play, its laughter and its tears, its mutual sacrifice, its inexpressible joys. May God help us to fulfill our devoutest hopes; and may the Spirit of the Christ reign as friendly Master and invisible but never forgotten Guest in all our homes."

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, E. H., *On the Training of Parents.*
Baker, Edna D., *Parenthood and Child Nurture.*
Baker & Taylor Co., The, *God's Minute.*
Betts, Anna T., *The Mother Teacher of Religion.*
Bigelow, M. A., *Sex Education.*
Breckenridge-Abbott, *Delinquent Child and the Home.*
Chicago Asso. for Child Study, *Intelligent Parenthood.*
Cope, H. F., *Religious Education in the Family.*
Cox, Harold, *The Problem of Population* (Eng.).
Douglas, H. P., *Wages and the Family.*
Dublin, L. I., *Population Problems* (U. S.).
DuBois, P., *The Natural Way.*
Fiske, G. W., *Purpose in Teaching Religion.*
Forbush, W. B., *The Boy-Problem in the Home.*
Grigg-Smith, T., *The Child's Knowledge of God.*
Groves, E. R., *Social Problems of the Family.*
Gruenberg, B. C., *Sons and Daughters.*
Hartshorne, H., *Childhood and Character.*
High, Stanley, *The Revolt of Youth.*
Luccock, G. N., *The Home God Meant.*
Mangold, G. B., *Problems of Child Welfare.*
Moxcey, M. C., *Girlhood and Character.*
Nat'l Cong. of Mothers, *Parents and Their Problems.*
Palmer, A. W., *The Drift Toward Religion.*
Popenoe, Paul, *Conservation of the Family.*
Royden, A. Maude, *Prayer as a Force.*

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

St. John, E. P., *Child Nature and Child Nurture.*
Sherman-Kent, *The Children's Bible.*
Sims, N. L., *Elements of Rural Sociology.*
Smyth, J. P., *How We Got Our Bible.*
Sneath-Hodges, *Religious Training in School and Home.*
Spencer, A. G., *The Family and Its Members.*
Van Waters, M., *Youth in Conflict.*
Weigle, L. A., *The Training of Children in the Christian Family.*
Willett-Morrison, *The Daily Altar.*
Williams, J. M., *Our Rural Heritage.*
Wood-Allen, M., *Making the Best of Our Children.*
Youtz, H. A., *The Supremacy of the Spiritual.*

INDEX

Alden, Priscilla, 23
Amherst alumni reading courses, 171
Apartment life, 37, 64–70, 72–77, 177, 242
Automobiles, social effects of, 72, 74, 106–107, 143, 173

Bachelor maids, 49–53
Bailey, A. E., 292
Beautiful, moral values of the, 243–246
Bible, best seller, 263
  for children, 273ff., 283–288
  for youth, 269–293
  how inspired? 248–252
  in great literature, 276–279
  in great music, 273
  in great paintings, 274–276
  in modern culture, 273–279, 288
  modern problem of, 158–160, 247–268
  popular fallacies about, 252
  religious source-book, 265–268, 270–273
  tracing its pedigree, 259–262
Birth-control, 114–116, 120, 176–178
Birth-rate, 21, 90–92, 103, 174–187
Broken homes, 115, 116, 121, 126–129
Bryn Mawr graduates, 51, 176
Burnham, R.W., 67

Cadman, S. Parkes, 111
Capernaum synagogue, 2
Careers for married women, 94–104
Cemeteries, courting in, 72
Centrifugal families, 58–59, 68–77, 107, 110–113, 195, 312–314
Character, fundamentals of, 241
Chicago Public School Association, 67–68, 94
Children, appreciation of, 185–187
  attitude toward, 174–187
  criticism of parents by, 5, 8–9, 132–136
  exploitation of, 42, 296
  high cost of, 174–179
  problems of, 132–152
  religious problems of, 153
  rights of, 41, 46
  value of, 183–185
Children's Bible, 273, 283
Children's Bureau, 93
Chivalry, 78
Church, home coöperation with, 294–306
  young people's program, 301–306
City homes, 57–77, 105–131, etc.
  housing problem, 57, 63–70
Clinton, Inez F., 246
Coe, George A., 236

College students, 116–117
Colonial house, charm of, 44
Companionate marriage, 77, 104, 114–118, 120–125, 178, 203, 224
Coolidge, Calvin, 201
Cope, Henry F., 309
Country homes, 19–26, 31–39, 44, 112–113, 172, 174
Country life, home-centered, 113
Courts of domestic relations, 129
Cox, H., 181, 187
Crackanthorpe, M., 181
Curry, Bruce, 151

Death-rate, 64, 90–93, 103, 187
Decentralized homes, 57–61, 74–76, 107, 195
Delinquency of children, 64, 68, 94
Dewey, John, 35
Divorce, 62, 89, 114, 118, 122, 126–129, 185, 201–202, 207
  rare in Christian homes, 201–203, 206–208
Dublin, L. I., 48, 90, 92, 175
Dunlop, J. C., 93

Eddy, Sherwood, 180
Education, socialized, 35. *See also* Religious Education
Employed women, 48, 84–100
European birth-rates, 92

Fairmount Church, Cleveland Hts., 10–12, 226ff, 310–318
Family, anarchy, 194–195
  the arrested, 114–124, 178
  being modified, 6, 53–56, 95–104, 114–128
  centrifugal, 58, 59, 68–77, 107, 110–113
Family—(*Continued*)
  decentralized, 57–61, 74–76, 107, 195
  democracy, 196–200, 315
  devotions, 33, 70, 210, 237–240, 316
  discipline, 188–200, 315
  farm, 33–36, 113
  functions of the old-time, 21–26
  industrialized, 58, 61, 70
  made by the child, 56
  moral influence of, 76, 77, 240–245, 314, 315
  recreation, 72–75, 170–173, 314, 315
  responsibility, 5–8, 46, 52–56, 68, 186–188, 197, 198, 313ff.
  superior, 179–187
  tyranny, 40–43, 189–193
  unity, 37–39, 70, 314
Farm homes, 19–26, 31–39, 113, 173, 174
  tribute to, 34
Finley, John, 46
Franchise of women, 80, 81

Ghandi, Mahatma, 27
Giddings, F. H., 202
Groves, E. R., 88, 122, 185
Guiterman, Arthur, 218

Haaren High School, 67
Hall, N. M., and Wood, I. F., 292
Harvard graduates, 176
High-school problems, 136–152
Home, attractiveness to children, 72, 73
  broken, 116, 121, 126–129
  decentralized, 57–61, 74–76, 107, 195
  dedication, 211–223

Home—(*Continued*)
democracy, 196–200, 315
evolution of, 24–28, 77, 114–128
in city, 57–77, etc.
in country, 33–36, 113
industrialized, 58, 61, 70
in suburbs, 10–12, 67–69, 75, etc.
neglect of religion, 2, 3, 6–9, etc.
non-functioning, 6, 7, 74–76
obligation to maintain, 46–56, 65–69
the old-time, 19–45
ultra-modern, 6, 55, 57ff., 112, 145, 194, 312
Home-centered life, 38, 39, 71–76, 314
Home-making, 83, 84, 101, 102
Homesteaders, 20

Imagination, moral function of, 244–246
Individualism in the family, 52–55, 108, 112, 194–195
Infant mortality, 92, 93

Jazz, 111
Jesus, ideal for youth, 159
Joy-riding, 143–144

Kent, Charles F., 282, 285
Knight, M. M., 122

Litany for Fathers and Mothers, 213

Mangold, G. B., 64
Manhattan, loss of population, 67
Marlatt, Earl, 214
Marriage, companionate, 77, 104, 114–118, 120–125, 178, 203, 224
Marriage—(*Continued*)
higher standards, 50–52
permanence of, 53, 54, 71, 118, 120–124, 128, 129
slackers, 47–49, 53
Married women's work, 48, 84–100
McIntire, A. T., 279
Mechanism and morals, 149, 150
Millionaire families, 177
Motherhood, 55, 56, 100, 101, 183, 184, 274, 310

New England Primer, 191

Oxenham, John, 216

Palmer, Albert W., 235, 268
Parental tyranny, 40–43, 189–193
Parent-teachers' associations, 67, 94, 298
Parents, religious problems of, 224–246, 307–318
Parthenon, 1
Petting, 72, 108, 143–148, 157
Phelps, W. L., 288
Plain Dealer, Cleveland, 72
Political status of women, 80, 81
Popenoe, Paul, 51, 127, 176, 179
Prayer, 233–240
Projects for children, 37, 241–243, 301–304
Public Ledger, Philadelphia, 118
Puritan home, 2, 5, 41–43, 189–193

Radio, 57, 111
Rauschenbusch, Walter, 214
Religion, definition, 205
demonstration of needed, 161ff.
an heirloom, 3, 203
in old-time home, 39, 41

Religion—(*Continued*)
insurance against broken homes, 225
moral safeguards of, 76, 131, 316
of youth, 153–165
progressive, 9–11, 114, 229, 306–318
reconstruction of, 307–318
some tests of, 226
stabilizes the family, 62, 76, 163, 201–210, 225, 308, 316
Religious art, 273–276, 292
dedication of a home, 211–223
education, 7, 134, 299–306, 317
problems of parents, 224–246, 307–318
problems of youth, 153–165
Rent problem, 63–69
Revolt of youth, 5, 53–55, 62, 107ff., 73, 132ff., 166
Rheims cathedral, 1
Rousseau, J. J., 16, 195

Safed the Sage, 73
School and the family, 13–18, 67, 295
Sex antagonism, 82, 85
education, 149
problems, 107–112, 114–118, 120–129, 138, 143–147
Sherman, H. A., and Kent, C. F., 285
Smith College, 94
Smith, H. Augustine, 211
Smith, Robert S., 238
Smoking by women, 109
Snowden, James H., 117
Social clinics, 129
Social conscience, 105
Space for a home, 63–69
Stanford graduates, 51
Suburban family life, 10–12, 67–69, 75
Sunday schools, 8, 9, 133, 295, 301, 317
Superior families dying, 179–182, 186, 187
Syracuse graduates, 51

Thompson, W. S., 174
Thrill-chasing, 112, 143–147
Time schedule problem, 70
Trial marriage, 114–129

Van Dyke, Henry, 69, 267, 272
Vassar graduates, 176

Wage-earning women, 84–99
Weigle, L. A., 189
Wellesley graduates, 51, 176
Women, economic independence of, 50, 88, 89
education of, 50–53
in industry, 84–99
new freedom of, 107–110
new status of, 78–104
political status of, 80, 81

Yale graduates, 176
Youth, religion of, 153–165, 269–293
revolt of, 5, 53–55, 62, 73, 107ff., 132ff., 166
social problems of, 132–152

Zorbaugh, H. W., 125

NEW YORK
Publishers of BOOKS and of
HARPER'S MAGAZINE
Established 1817

108891

HQ
734
F5

108891

Fiske, George W.
The changing family

DATE DUE | DE 1 '70 | BORROWER'S NAME

Fiske
Changing

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.